DOCUMENT RESUME

ED 022 863 VT 004 212

By-Sodofsky Stanley

WORKSHOP ON NONPROFESSIONAL CAREERS FOR DISADVANTAGED YOUTH, SUMMARY OF PROCEEDINGS (NEW YORK, DECEMBER 14-15, 1966).

New York Univ., N.Y. Center for the Study of Unemployed Youth.

Pub Date 66

Available from-Center of the Study of Unemployed Youth, Grad. School of Soc. Work, New York Univ., 853 Broadway, New York, N.Y. 10003 ($1.00).

EDRS Price MF-$0.75 HC Not Available from EDRS.

Descriptors-ADMINISTRATIVE CHANGE, *CAREER OPPORTUNITIES, *DISADVANTAGED YOUTH, *EMPLOYMENT PROGRAMS, MANPOWER UTILIZATION, *NONPROFESSIONAL PERSONNEL, POLICY, PROGRAM DESCRIPTIONS, PROGRAM DEVELOPMENT, PROGRAM PLANNING, WORKSHOPS, YOUTH PROGRAMS

Over 50 persons with special experience and interest in nonprofessional careers attended the workshop to explore the basic issues raised by that experience and to point the way toward future program implications. Critical issues which emerged centered around how to develop training capability, the problems related to established institutional procedures, and resistances and barriers put forth by unions and professional groups. The experiences of Howard University, Lincoln Hospital, and Mobilization for Youth indicated that salaries and upward job mobility were among the major operational issues. At the administrative and policy levels the issues discerned were largely relevant to civil service and its potential contribution to nonprofessional careers. Success in the California State Civil Service experience with nonprofessional careers was presented. The final phase of the workshop related to planning, implementation, and coordination of existing nonprofessional careers programs at all governmental levels. (ET)

C1

SUMMARY OF PROCEEDINGS: WORKSHOP ON NONPROFESSIONAL CAREERS FOR DISADVANTAGED YOUTH

ED022863

MANPOWER TRAINING SERIES

VT004212

CENTER FOR THE STUDY OF UNEMPLOYED YOUTH
GRADUATE SCHOOL OF SOCIAL WORK • NEW YORK UNIVERSITY

New York University
Graduate School of Social Work
Alex Rosen, Dean

•

Center For The Study of Unemployed Youth
Stanley Sadofsky, Director
Melvin Herman, Associate Director

•

Institutes and Curriculum Development Project
R. A. Nixon, Director
Maurice Mezoff, Associate Director

•

853 Broadway
New York, New York 10003

THIS DOCUMENT HAS BEEN REPRODUCED EXACTLY AS RECEIVED FROM THE
PERSON OR ORGANIZATION ORIGINATING IT. POINTS OF VIEW OR OPINIONS
STATED DO NOT NECESSARILY REPRESENT OFFICIAL OFFICE OF EDUCATION
POSITION OR POLICY.

SUMMARY OF PROCEEDINGS

WORKSHOP ON

NONPROFESSIONAL CAREERS FOR DISADVANTAGED YOUTH

U.S. DEPARTMENT OF HEALTH, EDUCATION & WELFARE
OFFICE OF EDUCATION

December 14-15, 1966
New York, N. Y.

This publication is part of a project conducted by the Center for the Study of Unemployed Youth of the Graduate School of Social Work of New York University under a grant provided by the Office of Juvenile Delinquency and Youth Development of the U.S. Department of Health, Education and Welfare to develop curriculum materials for program planners and operators.

TABLE OF CONTENTS

1. CENTER FOR THE STUDY OF UNEMPLOYED YOUTH
2. FOREWORD
3. WORKSHOP AGENDA
4. WORKSHOP PARTICIPANTS
5. SUMMARY
6. PROCEEDINGS
   - I. NONPROFESSIONAL CAREERS IN PERSPECTIVE—BASIC ISSUES
     - Remarks of Congressman James H. Scheuer
     - Remarks of Dr. Frank Riessman
     - Discussion
       - Goals of the Program
       - Strategy Issues
       - Issues of Controversy
   - II. OPERATIONAL EXPERIENCE-PROBLEMS AND ISSUES
     - Howard University Experience
     - Lincoln Hospital Experience
     - Mobilization for Youth Experience
     - Discussion
       - Problems of Salary Levels
       - General Operational Issues
       - Selection
       - New Careers and Upward Mobility
       - Job Development Problems
       - Other Considerations
       - New Functions
       - Barriers

III. POLICY AND ADMINISTRATIVE EXPERIENCE-PROBLEMS AND ISSUES
  The Federal Civil Service
  State Level — Policy and Administrative Experience
  Discussion
    Civil Service Barriers
    Civil Service and Upward Mobility
    Changing Civil Service
    Strategies for Institutional Change
    Change Through Client Involvement
    Change Through Staff Involvement
    Change In Institutions

IV. IMPLICATIONS FOR IMPLEMENTATION — PRESENT AND PROJECTED MANPOWER PROGRAMS
  Office of Economic Opportunity
  Neighborhood Youth Corps
  Discussion
    Strategy of Implementation
    Comprehensive Program Planning and Coordination
    Program Sponsorship
    Sponsorship in the Private Sector
    The Role of Educational Institutions
    Program Goals and Priorities
    Problems in Implementation

7. APPENDIX A — LEGISLATION

8. APPENDIX B — GUIDELINES

CENTER FOR THE STUDY OF UNEMPLOYED YOUTH

PURPOSE

The Center for the Study of Unemployed Youth of the Graduate School of Social Work reflects fundamental policies of New York University to reach out and contribute to the progress and development of the community.

The Center engages in a variety of activities designed to contribute to knowledge of the multiple problems faced by unemployed youth and to assist in the planning and administration of programs for such youth. By facilitating the interaction between practitioners and academic specialists, the Center hopes to improve understanding and skill in each area of concern resulting from the unemployment of young people. The activities of the Center are supported with funds provided by New York University, The Office of Economic Opportunity, the Office of Juvenile Delinquency and Youth Development, U.S. Department of Health, Education, and Welfare, and the U.S. Department of Labor.

PROGRAM

Research. The Center is currently engaged in a three-year study of changes in work attitudes and performance of youth enrolled in the Neighborhood Youth Corps in New York City. The initial publications of this study will be available in 1967.

Curriculum Materials. The Center develops training materials primarily through workshops and institutes, participated in by planners and operators of youth-work programs among federal, regional, state and community agencies. The curriculum materials are intended to serve the training needs of personnel engaged in youth-work programs at all levels.

Consultation Services. The Center serves as a resource to communities in the northeast region by providing consultation services to public and private agencies initiating, planning, operating and evaluating manpower programs for unemployed youth.

Technical Assistance. The Center offers technical assistance in the planning, operation and assessment of comprehensive manpower programs to selected metropolitan areas of the United States, including such specialized manpower activities as those developed under the Scheuer and Kennedy-Javits programs.

Training. The Center designs and conducts training programs for staff personnel at the Bureau of Work Programs. Programs are designed to provide an on-going training activity for present and new staff.

FOREWORD

By enacting the Scheuer amendment to the Economic Opportunity Act in the fall of 1966, Congress responded to a growing interest and experience in programs of non-professional careers (also called "new careers" or "subprofessional careers") for the unemployed and underemployed of the nation. It embraces the concept that disadvantaged persons, both young and older workers, be placed in or be trained for career employment in a variety of services such as hospitals, schools, and correctional institutions.

It has been estimated that 40,000 non-professional jobs have already been created, largely through the Office of Economic Opportunity positions in Community Action programs and Operation Headstart, and through Title I of the Elementary and Secondary Education Act for indigenous personnel.

At a time when early experience with programs of non-professional careers has begun to accumulate, and just prior to the implementation of the new Scheuer amendment, the Center for the Study of Unempoyed Youth brought together over 50 persons with special experience and interest in non-professional careers for a workshop whose purpose was to explore the basic issues raised by this experience and, hopefully, point the way toward their future program implications. As Dr. Melvin Herman, Professor of Social Work at New York University and co-director of the Center, suggested in his opening remarks to the workshop participants, "we hope that these discussions will review what we know, identify what we don't know and develop some ideas as to what the next steps ought to be."

Dr. Herman noted in his introduction that, "while much of the impact of non-professional programs will be felt by adults, we think that whatever is done for unemployed and disadvantaged adults will have important implications for youth. We therefore see a very marked relationship between our concern for unemployed youth and the very timely issues raised by the new non-professional careers programs."

Dr. Alex Rosen, Dean of The Graduate School of Social Work of New York University, related the non-professional programs to professional schools of social work by indicating that their traditional curriculum is under reconsideration "in the light of the great changes taking place in our society." He suggested that the present concentration on two levels of training —the master's and doctor's programs—may be reorganized. "We may see as many as seven different tracks to prepare people for different levels of professional responsibility," he said, "starting with the high school graduate and even below, and including work-study program at the two and four-year college levels, and several additional graduate levels."

The two-day workshop was organized into four session topics, each of which began with brief presentations by invited experts in the various areas. The speakers did not prepare formal papers but were asked "to identify some of the significant issues raised by the session topic and to use their presentations to stimulate discussions." The four session topics were:

(1) Non-professional Careers in Perspective—Basic Issues

(2) Operational Experience—Problems and Issues

(3) Policy and Administrative Problems—Problems and Issues

(4) Implications for Implementation—Present and Projected Manpower Programs

The workshop was structured to provide a maximum of candid give-and-take among the participants, without the pressures of passing resolutions or deciding upon specific recommendations. Dr. Herman asked the participants to "feel free to make any recommendations you choose, but do not feel we are striving for any consensus." The 54 invited participants represented the variety of institutions concerned with the policy and operational implications of non-professional programs. About 40 percent were federal, state and local government specialists; 32 percent were staff members of private, mainly non-profit organizations; 26 percent came from universities and one represented a labor union.

While no specific recommendations emerged from the workshop, as part of an evaluation procedure during the sessions the Center asked participants for an expression of opinion on several basic issues emerging from non-professional programs. Because a variety of objectives have been put forward as the non-professional careers concept has been developed, the Center asked the specialists, at the end of the workshop, to rank such suggested objectives in order of relative importance. As shown in the table below, the participants saw non-professional careers as primarily providing the poor with jobs and income, rather than as a strategy to improve the quality of human services.

Main Objective of Non-professional Careers Programs

(a) Provide income for the poor	73%
(b) Improve services to clients*	29%

(* Forty-two percent of the participants ranked this objective as second most important. Choice of more than one makes it possible to have more than 100%.)

(c) Alleviate professional shortages	13%
(d) Heighten participation of poor	10%

The participants listed health services (85%) and education (71%) as the most promising fields for non-professional employment, and viewed upgrading (50%), training (45%) and friction with professionals (33%) as the most serious barriers to effective implementation of the programs. The workshop participants were also asked to rank the kinds of disadvantaged groups to which they would give priority in designing non-professional programs. The results favored heads of families (38%) and the long-term unemployed (37%), and unemployed youth (21%).

The conference proceedings summarized below are based upon major excerpts from a stenographic transcript of the workshop sessions, edited to emphasize the major issues raised in the presentations and discussions.

The Center for the Study of Unemployed Youth conducted the workshop as part of its curriculum development project, sponsored by the Office of Juvenile Delinquency and Youth Development of the Department of Health, Education and Welfare.

WORKSHOP AGENDA

Carnegie Endowment International Center
Terrace Lounge
345 East 46th Street, New York City

WEDNESDAY, DECEMBER 14, 1966

9:00 AM — 12:30 PM

Session I — "Nonprofessional Careers in Perspective — Basic Issues"

Chairman: Dr. Melvin Herman, Co-Director
Center for Study of Unemployed Youth

Panelists: Dr. Alex Rosen, Dean
Graduate School of Social Work
New York University

"Legislative Intent and Perspectives"
Congressman James H. Scheuer
U.S. House of Representatives

"Where We Are Now — Major Issues"
Dr. Frank Reissman
Professor of Educational Sociology
New York University

Discussion

2:00 PM — 5:00 PM

Session II — "Operational Experience — Problems and Issues"

Chairman: Maurice W. Mezoff, Associate Director
Institutes and Curriculum Development
Center for the Study of Unemployed Youth

Panelists: William Denham
Assistant Director for Training
Institute for Youth Studies
Howard University

Mrs. Sally Jacobson
Director of Training
Lincoln Hospital Mental Health Services

Mrs. Anita Vogel, Director
Department of Adult Employment
Mobilization for Youth, Inc.

THURSDAY, DECEMBER 15, 1966

9:00 AM — 12:00 Noon

Session III — "Policy and Administrative Experience — Problems and Issues"

Chairman: Stanley Sadofsky, Co-Director
Center for the Study of Unemployed Youth

Panelists: J. Douglas Grant, Director
New Careers Development Project
Institute for the Study of Crime and Delinquency

George P. Hodges, Chief
Staffing Branch
New York Region
U.S. Civil Service Commission

Discussion

2:00 PM — 5:00 PM

Session IV — "Implications for Implementation — Present and Projected Manpower Programs"

Chairman: Dr. R. A. Nixon, Director
Institutes and Curriculum Development
Center for the Study of Unemployed Youth

Panelists: Mrs. Roslyn D. Kane, Manpower Specialist
Office of Economic Opportunity

Mark Battle, Deputy Director
Neighborhood Youth Corps

Discussion

WORKSHOP PARTICIPANTS

NAME	ORGANIZATION
Dorothy Allensworth	Neighborhood Youth Corps White Plains, New York
Terry Alt	U.S. Office of Education Department of Health, Education and Welfare Washington, D.C.
Mark Battle	Neighborhood Youth Corps Washington, D.C.
Garda W. Bowman	Study of Auxiliary Personnel in Education Bank Street College New York City
David Bushnell	U.S. Office of Education Department of Health, Education and Welfare Washington, D.C.
Richard Carleton	U.S. Office of Education Department of Health, Education and Welfare Washington, D.C.
Constance Carr	School of Education New York University New York City
Robert Carr	University Research Corporation Washington, D.C.
Edward Cohen	Office of Congressman James H. Scheuer Washington, D.C.
Edmund Clark	Community Progress Incorporated New Haven, Connecticut
John Connorton	Greater New York Hospital Association New York City
Frank J. Coyle	U.S. Office of Education Department of Health, Education and Welfare New York City

NAME	ORGANIZATION
William Denham	Institute for Youth Studies Howard University Washington, D.C.
Jacob Fishman	University Research Corp. Washington, D.C.
Daniel Fox	Commonwealth Service Corps Boston, Massachusetts
Marcia Freedman	Conservation of Human Resources Columbia University New York City
Gertrude Goldberg	Graduate School of Education Yeshiva University New York City
J. Douglas Grant	New Careers Development Project The Institute for the Study of Crime and Delinquency Sacramento, California
Richard Greenfield	Job Counseling Center New York City
Charles Grosser	Graduate School of Social Work New York University New York City
George Hall	Office of Economic Opportunity Manpower Division Washington, D.C.
Lucia Hatch	University Research Corporation Washington, D.C.
R. Herman	Office of Economic Opportunity Washington, D.C.
Beatrice Hill	Neighborhood Youth Corps Washington, D.C.
George P. Hodges	U.S. Civil Service Commission New York City
Sally Jacobson	Lincoln Hospital Mental Health Services Bronx, New York

NAME	ORGANIZATION
Roslyn D. Kane	Office of Economic Opportunity Washington, D.C.
Jonathan Kaplan	Community Action Institute Community Progress, Incorporated New Haven, Connecticut
Sarah Kestenbaum	Sub-Professional Training Program Consortium of Universities Washington, D.C.
Harry Kranz	Bureau of Employment Security U.S. Department of Labor Washington, D.C.
Robert Leeds	Social Service Employees Union New York City
Robert Lefferts	Greenleigh Associates New York City
Seymour Lesh	National Committee on Employment of Youth New York City
Donna Levine	Welfare Administration Department of Health, Education and Welfare Washnigton, D.C.
Louis Levine	Institute for Research on Human Resources Pennsylvania State University Washington, D.C.
Frank Logue	Community Progress, Incorporated New Haven, Connecticut
Edith Lynton	National Committee on Employment of Youth New York City
Ruth Maitland	Office of Juvenile Delinquency and Youth Development Department of Health, Education and Welfare Washington, D.C.

NAME	ORGANIZATION
Martin Moed	Mobilization for Youth, Inc. New York City
Philip Morgan	Health Careers United Hospital Fund of New York New York City
Arnold Nemore	National Manpower Policy Task Force Washington, D.C.
Glenn Parker	New Jersey Community Action Training Institute Trenton, New Jersey
Frank Riessman	School of Education New York University New York City
Bernard Rivkin	Rutgers University New Brunswick, New Jersey
Alex Rosen	Graduate School of Social Work New York University New York City
Tanya Russell	Lincoln Hospital Mental Health Services Bronx, New York
Fred Schenck	Office of Economic Opportunity Washington, D.C.
Representative James H. Scheuer	House of Representatives U.S. Congress Washington, D.C.
Aaron Schmais	Lincoln Hospital Mental Health Services Bronx, New York
Thomas Sessel	Community Progress, Incorporated New Haven, Connecticut
Eunice Shatz	University Research Corporation Washington, D.C.

NAME	**ORGANIZATION**
Leonard Stern	Office of Juvenile Delinquency and Youth Development Department of Health, Education and Welfare Washington, D.C.
Arnold Trebach	University Research Corporation Washington, D.C.
Anita Vogel	Mobilization for Youth, Inc. New York City
Ethel Weinfeld	New York Department of Welfare Division of Employment and Rehabilitation New York City
Daniel Yankelovich	Daniel Yankelovich, Incorporated New York City
Howard Young	New York Services for the Orthopedically Handicapped New York City

STAFF

CENTER FOR THE STUDY OF UNEMPLOYED YOUTH

Melvin Herman

Stanley Sadofsky

R. A. Nixon

Lee Filerman

Maurice Mezoff

Michael Munk

Alvin Mickens

SUMMARY OF PROCEEDINGS

WORKSHOP ON NONPROFESSIONAL CAREERS FOR DISADVANTAGED YOUTH

SUMMARY

Workshop Focus

The workshop focused on nonprofessional careers, particularly those in publicly sponsored human services, as a developing approach to the solution of manpower problems. The meeting brought together some 50 individuals and representatives of groups that have had significant experience in nonprofessional careers programs for the purposes of learning what experience has taught us to date, what major issues and problems have been identified. It was hoped that such a free exchange of ideas and a clarification of thinking would help define goals and determine priorities among basic objectives.

The workshop was timely in that the federal government was heavily involved in working out the implementations of the Scheuer new careers amendment to the Economic Opportunity Act. The meeting provided a forum for discussing many of the issues faced in this effort.

Background

The initial portion of the workshop centered on legislative perspectives of the program in terms of the intent of the Congress. It was indicated that the legislation was viewed mainly as a vehicle for providing additional opportunities for employment of the poor.

Discussion revealed that the Office of Economic Opportunity has had considerable experience with this objective through Community Action programs which employed more than 25,000 nonprofessionals as neighborhood workers and in carrying out a wide variety of other tasks geared to helping the poor. Additional experience has been gained from the use of nonprofessionals as welfare aides, nursing aides, teaching aides, and in a number of jobs in the correction field. These were mainly demonstration and experimental programs carried out by a wide range of groups with varying objectives.

Goals

The discussion further revealed that major goals of the program have been generally defined as:

1. a solution to shortages of professional personnel
2. increasing health, education, welfare, and other human services, particularly to the poor through the reorganization of delivery techniques and
3. the creation of new jobs that provide an opportunity for upward mobility through channels other than previous and traditional means.

It was pointed out that in designing programs these goals might be in conflict with one another and hence needed clarification as to major emphasis for the total movement.

Basic Issues

Critical issues which emerged centered around how to develop training capability, the problems related to established institutional procedures, and resistances and barriers put forth by unions and professional groups. The redefinition of professional roles and the definition of nonprofessional roles, and the establishment of upward mobility opportunities on new nonprofessional jobs have yet to be achieved. A warning was sounded that this new approach might be turned into a source of cheap labor for carrying out professional tasks, with a resultant decline in the quality of human services.

Strategy issues were discussed in relation to techniques that would enlist the cooperation and support of "the establishment" in preference to an attack upon those concerned with traditional approaches. Special emphasis was placed on bringing about changes in Civil Service which might lead to a large number of new opportunities for careers in the public sector.

Recent Experience — Operational Level

The experience of Howard University, Lincoln Hospital and Mobilization for Youth were analyzed from the viewpoint of problems and issues at the operational level of programs.

Even limited experience has revealed that, with proper training and support, nonprofessionals can function well in the delivery of services to people, can relate to and work with professional personnel and do have a unique contribution to make in providing these services.

The discussion highlighted a number of problems at the operational level: Entry level salaries are not always realistic enough to meet the basic needs of nonprofessionals; upward mobility has not been achieved in many programs; selection processes have not been refined and present experiences have indicated "creaming" with selection based upon prejudices and stereotypes of the "human services" person meeting the image of the professional.

Debate turned on the need for avoidance of rigid upward mobility criteria on nonprofessional jobs which might prove detrimental to the growth of the program. It was noted that mobility was not universal in the American employment pattern. It was generally agreed, however, that the opportunity for upward mobility was basic to the program.

Job development was seen as a critical component requiring immediate attention if future success is to be assured.

Recent Experience — Policy Level

Issues and problems at the administrative and policy levels were examined and discussed. Relevant procedures and policies of the Federal Civil Service were presented along with new programs for nonprofessional careers. In addition, the barriers within the Civil Service system related to job redesign, resistance to change by unions and professional associations, the need for written examinations, publicity requirements which prevent solution of job problems of target groups, and regulations relating to residence were pointed out.

Success in the California State Civil Service experience was presented in terms of methods and techniques for inducing agency or institutional change, particularly at the policy and administrative levels. The focus of the presentation was upon changes brought about through client and staff involvement in both the planning and the implementation of nonprofessional careers programs. Special emphasis was placed upon the need for changing systems and procedures within the Civil Service as a prerequisite for achieving upward mobility as well as job development. New careers or jobs begin with an approach that meets agency needs.

Next Steps — Planning and Implementation

The final phase of the workshop related to the nonprofessional careers program as part of an overall effort. Emphasis was placed upon the new legislation and the planning done by the Office of Economic Opportunity and Labor Department in order to implement it.

Special problems in coordination of existing programs at the local and state level suggested the need for local mechanisms such as Manpower

Councils. These could mesh nonprofessional career programs with existing efforts on manpower and at the same time meet the unique needs of each community. Program sponsorship revealed a variety of problems. The need for participation and sponsorship on the part of the private sector of the economy was stressed.

Discussion about program goals and priorities generated ideas relating to the need for first developing technical assistance programs, training capacities and then, heavy emphasis on an organized job development effort.

Over and above these priorities, the need for job re-engineering was seen as a major one and the lack of available people skilled in job analysis was seen as a potential obstacle to progress.

The workshop made no attempt to resolve the issues or solve the problems but it did provide a means of giving a clearer focus to those questions that require further thinking about for the planning and implementation of New Career programs.

PROCEEDINGS

I. NONPROFESSIONAL CAREERS IN PERSPECTIVE — BASIC ISSUES

Remarks of Congressman James H. Scheuer:
"Legislative Intent and Perspectives"

I am delighted to join with all of you who are really pioneers in this new field of nonprofessional programs — a field that I believe is going to go through a period of absolutely explosive growth. It is a truism to say that there is no force on earth as powerful as an idea whose time has come. I think it is probably obvious to most of us that the time has come when we have to face up to the utter impossibility of meeting the demands of our society, with its increasingly sophisticated level of expectation about the kind of public services it wants in such fields as health, education and police work, through the production of enough professionals in the decade or two to come. Our professional institutions are so clearly incapable of meeting this need that the most optimistic Dr. Pangloss couldn't begin to think of the provision of an adequate number of professionals in the generation to come.

So the only other option we have is the use of sub-professionals. I think this is transparently clear to everyone here, but it isn't quite so clear to the public at large, and to some of the labor unions and other institutions in our society. This is part of the challenge in the years ahead. But I really am convinced that what may be a modest program today is going to grow tremendously in the next few years, assuming that what we do in the next few years makes sense.

The Need For Nonprofessional Workers

When I first became interested in this field—in the beginning of 1965—I read a study produced by the Office of Economic Opportunity that indicated a manpower need for sub-professionals in our health, education and welfare services in excess of 5.2 million. That was before the passage of Medicare, with its tremendous manpower needs in areas such as home visitation personnel. I think that five-million figure is a conservative figure, and most of you know we only have about two-and-a-half million unemployed in this country.

So the lesson is pretty simple and pretty obvious: If we take every unemployed, alienated, apathetic, disoriented, submarginally motivated person in our urban and rural ghettos and give them the required compensated on-the-job training, there will not only be a place for them in our society, but a very vital and constructive one in the expansion and improvement of our public services.

We have been starving our public services, as Professor Galbraith put it about a decade ago when he wrote of our "private affluence and our public squalor." I think the kind of sub-professional program that we are discussing now is the only hope for relieving the squalor of all our public services.

Basic Problems

Now, as I see it, there are a number of very basic problems that we ought to address ourselves to. The first is to help all the professional groups design the new subprofessional jobs, which also means the redesign of the professional jobs by carving out of them all those functions which sub-professionals can usefully perform.

In order to do that, you are going to have to take on all of the "unions"—I use that term broadly — the doctors' union, the AMA, and the state employees organizations, the nurses' union, the hospital administrators' union, the school principals' union, all of which are institutional arrangements by which these professionals seeks basically to preserve the status quo.

We must prove to these "unionists" that this new field of sub-professional development, far from being a threat to their integrity, productiveness and professional stature, actually will enhance the quality of their work, their working conditions and their status in the community. Sub-professional programs will enable them to do their job satisfactorily, which they aren't doing now.

It is an anomaly to me that the nurses, for example, will fight a redesign of their professional jobs that would cut out their sub-professional functions, while at the same time they go on strike in New York City because they have to sort towels, answer the telephone and deliver food. They don't like doing sub-professional jobs, but when you start to tamper with the overall dimensions and design of their functions, they get itchy and leery and feel very basically threatened.

Dealing with the unions in these professions is a very touchy business. If I had to say, from the little experience I have had, which of these major "unions" are the most open minded about change, I'd say that the police chiefs are about as receptive as any. They are under more pressure on the blocks and in the neighborhoods to provide better police services and more bodies in uniform, and they want to free their professional police officers to be visible on the streets.

These are my first few ideas: The redesign of the professional functions; the design of the sub-professional functions; and the work with the "unions" which provide the inertia and protective surroundings that constitute an impediment to change.

Some government institutions are another impediment to change. One of the basic jobs that must be done is to convince the federal Civil Service Commission and the 50 state civil service commissions to take a hand in redesigning professional and designing the new sub-professional jobs through the entire hierarchy of government.

The next major target, I believe, are the teaching institutions, and hopefully you are going to exert tremendous influence on them. One of the lessons I have learned is that in addition to training the sub-professionals properly, it is absolutely essential to train the professionals — the supervisors and the administrators — in the use of sub-professionals. They have to be oriented up and down the line in order for both the sub-professional and the professional to function effectively.

There are the twin dangers of the under-utilization of the sub-professionals — when they are simply given an occasional chore and told to sit in the corner in the meantime — and their over-utilization, when a harrassed school administrator will turn a classroom over to a sub-professional who hasn't been trained to handle it.

The proper employment and exploitation of the talents and capabilities of the sub-professional by the professional is enormously important, and perhaps the training of professionals in this area really should start at the point of their own job training. For example, the medical school curriculum should be designed to train prospective doctors in the use of sub-professionals.

You all have, then, a tremendous "information and education" program ahead of you. You must work with all the institutions and civil service commissions at the federal and state levels, including the state employment agencies that will tax your patience, your imagination, and your ability to survive and maintain your equanimity, if possible, but surely your sanity.

When I say "you," I am talking about the institutions that are taking leadership here, including NYU, Howard University, and Bank Street College. I hope these great institutions will do two things: Produce written material that is easily understandable and, second, organize through their own resources or with the help of the Departments of HEW, Labor, or the OEO, some face-to-face conferences.

I see a need for a series of perhaps twelve regional conferences, that would bring together elementary school principals, nurses, the doctors, the hospital administrators, the Civil Service officials, and others. Another series of regional conferences could involve the teaching professions, police academies, teacher training schools, medical school deans, with the purpose of redesigning their professional curricula to include a basic structured ingredient that would teach these future professionals how to use sub-professionals effectively.

Politically this idea is right at this time. I think one of the reasons we got a substantial program for the training and employment of the sub-professionals through the last Congress was, first, because there wasn't very much notice. We got it included in the bill in the subcommittee, and there was so much worry about rent strikes and demonstrations and how neighborhood workers were going to turn into precinct workers tomorrow and run against the Congressman or the Mayor that nobody noticed this program very much.

Once we had gotten it included at the subcommittee stage, nobody was about to reach for any headlines or make any public uproars by highlighting the sub-professional program which was very nicely hidden in between the pages, and there was absolutely no discussion of it on the floor of the House and practically none in the discussion of the poverty bill by the full committee. Because it was non-controversial, the professionals — the really knowledgeable people on both side of the aisle — thought: "What's wrong with training people for jobs? As long as we are not going to make revolutionaries or prospective Congressmen out of them, it'll be okay".

This is how the entire poverty program got infected with political overtones that really made life very tough for it in the last session, and one of the reasons that the sub-professional program breezed through without any trouble was because it wasn't politically controversial. It didn't have some of the overtones of violent change in the political structure that some of the other well-constructed elements of the poverty program, such as the community action programs, have.

Basically, then, from all points of view, sub-professional programs are really the wave of the future. But the wave of the future may be held up in midstream while we settle things out in Vietnam. I believe that when the resources become available we can spend this $3 billion or $4 billion a month that we are spending in Vietnam, for a multibillion dollar a year sub-professional program. If we only hired a million sub-professional aides, trained them, and put them into a $4.5 or $5 billion public service program, that would be only 20 per cent of the need for sub-professionals.

I believe that that time is not far off and can be measured in months — 30 or 40 months. In the meantime, we have a period of learning. I believe that if we do it right, if we really apply our intellects and our disciplines to designing these programs and working intelligently with the kind of groups that I have mentioned we can use the next year or two as a vital demonstration and testing period. Then, by the time we extricate ourselves from Vietnam and pour the resources into our cities that should have long since been channeled into them, we will have already proven our program and developed the tools and techniques for making it work.

I believe it will improve the quality of American life, and I believe everybody associated with it is going to be proud of the role that they have played during these early years.

Remarks of Dr. Frank Riessman: "Where We Are Now — Major Issues"

For the first time in Washington, we have an approach to poverty that really has some possibility of doing something about poverty. I think Operation Headstart is lovely, but it doesn't do anything about poverty. I think the Neighborhood Youth Corps is lovely but it doesn't do anything about poverty.

So for the first time we have an approach which suggests the possibility of people moving out of poverty, and this can only be possible if the sub-professional jobs, which, as Representative Scheuer says, are being created and will be created in large numbers, are translated into careers, and the soft money is translated into hard money and the jobs are translated into training and upgrading and colleges and universities are brought into the field.

Training Issues

In other words, if the people who are getting these sub-professional entry jobs are going to have the possibility of moving all the way to being professionals, we are going to have to introduce a new approach to training. Thus far, I have been fairly unhappy with sub-professional training. The training designs have been very limited, although there are some exciting exceptions, such as the Howard University projects and the Lincoln Hospital project in New York, but they certainly haven't become nationally instituted by any means.

Consequently, I think that one of the real issues of the present period is how to develop this training and how to bring colleges into the field. In the Newark project we plan to send clinical professors to give courses in the field to sub-professionals on the job, such as teacher aides. These courses will be given college credit, so that the individual, while working full-time, can have the opportunity of moving up the line. This requires career steps in the whole job, so that a teacher aide can move up to teacher assistant and all the way up to regular teacher. So in the Newark project, the field experience, plus the systematic training courses that are brought into the field, are to be given college credit. This is the next step and we should look at it very carefully.

Controversial Issues

On the question of controversy raised by Representative Scheuer, I think that if the sub-professional movement is really to spread and become a major force in the United States, which I think will occur, it is going to require some political controversy. These are the issues that Representative Scheuer suggested: persuading and assisting the Civil Service Commission to change their requirements and the colleges to change their training courses, the development of training designs, the opening of large numbers of these jobs — jobs that produce careers rather than mere jobs. I think this is going to require a movement with some political demands, not just experimentation by professionals.

I think the leaders of this movement are going to be the new careerists themselves. For example, there are emerging a number of groups in California who have started a new careers movement and are holding a major new careers conference early in January.

The new careers movement that they are talking about will be concerned with the goals of unionization or organization of the non-professionals in new forms. Not just organization of nonprofessioals themselves but perhaps for the first time by nonprofessionals and professionals together. I feel strongly that at least a large segment of professionals have an enormous amount to gain from the introduction of nonprofessionals in their various fields.

It will produce, I think, an exciting, revolutionary reorganization of the service institutions in our society. I think large numbers of professionals, but not by any means all, very much want this reorganization because they want a creative professional life. Most of us have been deprived of that. Most professionals are quite alienated and bored with a good deal of their work because they do sub-professional tasks which they do not want to do and which are not what they were trained to do.

I think the reorganization of their job will produce a whole series of new possibilities for professionals. They will have the opportunity to be much more creative in program planning, training, administration and so on. There is a large segment of professionals who are quite interested in this and who are, I think, the initial potential joiners of a new careers movement. I don't think we should have a new careers movement that organizes non-professionals alone. We should organize the professionals with them and include friends and allies in this kind of broad anti-poverty movement.

Present Dangers

There are a number of dangers that I want to warn against. One is the use of the hospital model. Non-professionals have been used in the medical profession for many, many years. I recently came out of a hospital and I had a good opportunity to observe how many different people come to do how many different tasks for you, and I rarely saw a professional. You see some professionals occasionally but you see a lot of sub-professionals who have jobs but cannot break into any career.

They cannot move out of these dead end, sub-professional jobs which have been produced. The medical profession did brilliant work in producing these jobs by subdividing the technical tasks in the hospital laboratory, for example, but they did not provide a model of movement in which people could start at the entry position and move up.

I think this lack of emphasis on the career aspect of sub-professional jobs is a tremendously significant danger in the sub-professional movement in the United States, and, therefore, it seems to me that the movement has to place great stress on this question of upward mobility.

Another danger stands out in the recent studies of non-professionals*: that the non-professionals who have been hired have been a highly "creamed" group with very high percentages of high school graduates and Negro women. I propose that the whole issue of male employment is a significant one. I find myself strangely in agreement with Moynihan, who calls for the producing of 250,000 jobs for males. I agree with his emphasis on jobs for males, but I think a million jobs is much nearer to what we really need. By the way, it is not expensive. It would cost about $5 billion a year.

As Representative Scheuer said, this would provide a tremendous expansion of employment in sub-professional areas, but I think we have to stress employment for "hard core" males and watch out for a continuation of this "creaming" process.

Another danger is to glamorize the sub-professional as though he knows everything and the professionals only need to learn from him. A two-way learning process is required.

Incidentally, nonprofessionals, if they were here, would probably remind us immediately of the opposite. Professionals, they might say, don't listen to us but they run the whole show and feel only they can do the teaching. This is the opposite of the glamorization danger and I think both have to be watched very carefully.

Another danger for the future is the concept of training that has typically developed in this country. It is based on the assumption that you must start in kindergarten, move on to elementary school, high school, college and graduate school — and then you become, for example, an intern, a resident and finally a doctor. It is a long, long, bit, and it has prevented people, if they are over 21, from considering seriously the idea of having a career.

Even the "Freedom Budget" seems to rule out the large numbers of senior citizens in the United States from these careers. I don't rule it out at all, provided you don't have to go through this formal education but can start immediately on a job, getting appropriate credit for your previous experience. You can find career shifts for all people at all ages, and not just for poor people, but for housewives, returning Peace Corps people, and college graduates without any specialty.

One of my purposes here is to call attention to the fact that training must not be just on-the-job training. You cannot go very far from what you learn directly from the jobs. Let's state that very frankly. It is good inductive field training, but the next step is systematic training related to building

* e.g. Yankelovich, Inc.

concepts from the job experience and relating that to, for example, nursing concepts, medical concepts, and early childhood concepts in relation to schools. This requires a unity of the college programs with the field situation.

Another danger to watch, if the movement proliferates rapidly, as it might when the Vietnam War ends, is trainer shortages. If sub-professional programs become crucial weapons in the "War against Poverty", we will immediately have a training gap — a problem of not having enough trainers or supervisors.

Remember, there is a manpower shortage of professionals in the first place, so that we can't steal them easily. We have to produce a new training capability and I suggest one of the sources for this is the immediate career upgrading of the non-professional assistant trainers, assistant supervisors and so on. Where to recruit this middle level training capability is going to be a very crucial question.

Present Planning

Finally, let me say that a great deal is going on in terms of developing this new careers movement, combining professionals and non-professionals. Conferences are planned throughout the United States. The Citizens Crusade Against Poverty is planning regional conferences and looking forward to a national new careers conference. Others are to be held in San Francisco, Los Angeles and Pittsburgh. The National Committee on Employment of Youth is planning such a conference, and a New York union of the Community Social Agencies is organizing nonprofessionals in the Youth-in-Action program in Brooklyn.

The welfare rights movement is beginning to broaden and raise the question not simply of guaranteed income, but of guaranteed jobs. I think this is a very significant broadening for that movement. The SCLC and the Urban League are also formulating programs such more in these terms.

The significance of the "Freedom Budget" and the whole emphasis on full employment raise the question also of these new kinds of jobs. There will be, for example, a need for fifty thousand programmers in the new computer industry. There is no reason why the requirements for these programmers could not be established on the new careers model, rather than on traditional college training.

The Americans for Democratic Action have proposed five-million of these jobs, one-million per year. The President's Automation Commission called for 500,000.

I think also we are beginning to see the effect of the new nonprofessional jobs on the old nonprofessional jobs. For example, Sumner Rosen, Educational Director of the State, County and Municipal Workers union in New York, has developed a plan for the upgrading of nurses aides. Nonprofessionals have existed in hospitals and schools for years and years. The question is: Are they going to do the same kind of thing they were before, doing the lowest jobs and not having the opportunity to grow?

The new careers movement also has social and institutional change potential which we haven't begun to examine. So far it has, unfortunately, been absorbed too much into the old public works model of the Thirties, and the implications for social change have not been fully understood.

How will it change, for example, the great variety of institutions, from education to social work, from corrections to police work? How will it produce pressure for an increase of wages throughout the entire society and for an end to unemployment? It all has enormous implications for organized labor as an ally.

I would be very careful, by the way, not to fight out the union issue, and over antagonize the labor movement. They are an important ally, who could benefit greatly from the nonprofessional movement.

It further has the possibility of revitalizing the civil rights movement. I think the slogan there could be: "New careers for equal opportunity". One of the things that has deterred the civil rights movement is its lack of an economic program. Too much of its emphasis, I think, has been spent on consumption, education, public accommodations and housing issues. But this is only part of the picture. Now we need to point more to the production side: the development of economic power through jobs and careers. This demand has been lacking in the civil right movement but I think the turning point has been reached with Rustin and the "Freedom Budget", and with the new thinking of Martin Luther King and the Urban League.

I look forward to a period in the coming year in which there will be a great deal of ferment and controversy and a great many demands from people other than professionals, technicians, program planners and policymakers. The idea has caught on quite well among elements of the old type of associations like the NEA, and elements of the trade unions.

This new movement is decisive if it effects significant institutional change in our society; to guarantee that jobs become careers, to guarantee that we produce meaningful training and development, and to guarantee that we get changes in institutions like Civil Service.

DISCUSSION

Goals of the Program

M. HERMAN: A number of objectives for new careers programs are beginning to be clarified.

First, there is the objective of social change. Second, a series of objectives that, under the new careers models, can increase the caliber and quality of human services. And third: to get people out of poverty. These are at least three objectives which we have heard in this conversation and read in the literature.

Are we talking about all three at the same time or are any of these in conflict with each other and if so, which ought to be given priority? Are we really talking of an anti-poverty program? What are the consequences if we define it one way or another?

Logically, at least, one would assume that a statement of objectives should have some impact upon the nature of the program which develops out of those objectives. I am wondering if the Congressional intention of the Scheuer Amendment, for example, was essentially as an anti-poverty measure, or was it seen as a human services measure?

A year or two from now when Congressman Scheuer's Committee evaluates the impact of the new program, will it do so in terms of (1) social change, (2) anti-poverty or (3) increasing human services?

CONGRESSMAN SCHEUER: I think you dignify the Congress when you ask too deeply what our intent was. This was a conspiratorial operation. It succeeded because people in the poverty program were so worried about Job Corps kids setting fire to the buildings they were in and cutting each other up, that all the attention was elsewhere. So, we managed to sneak this in through the back door.

I think, to the extent that this program proves that we can both enhance public service and provide jobs for unemployed people, it is going to be acceptable to Congress.

Some of the multiple goals that you mentioned may be slightly inconsistent. Obviously to the extent that we go to the bottom of the barrel and aim this program toward the structurally unemployed — those who inherited poverty, the third generation welfare families, the third generation public housing families — it is going to be more expensive and difficult to succeed than if we continue the traditional "creaming" operation.

I don't want to do just creaming, and I don't want to just go to the bottom of the barrel either. I think we ought to do a little of both. I think we ought to take kids who haven't finished high school, but who are just on the verge of real employability, and who aren't the really crippled high school dropouts with all of the deep wounds of inherited poverty.

I'd like to prove that the program can work, and I want to put at least in some areas the best possible face on it, but I wouldn't like to see it be entirely a creaming program. I think this program can do a lot of different things in a lot of different ways.

One of the goals of the program is to provide a quantitative increase in public service, and another is to provide a qualitative improvement in the role of the professional so that he can spend more of his time on his professional functions.

We heard at a conference on medical services that Dr. Fishman organized at Howard University a month or two ago that a doctor in Chicago indicated that 40 per cent to 60 per cent of a doctor's time was spent in nonprofessional functions. We heard from the police chiefs that an even smaller percentage of a police officer's time is spent in professional functions.

I suggest there is a third goal for this program's impact on public services. It is a qualitative improvement in the effectiveness with which a professional can function apart from giving him more professional hours. In many of these services, the sub-professionals make a qualitative contribution — for example — as a cultural bridge between the middle income Irish, Italian, or Polish cop, and a minority population with whom he can't really engage in meaningful discourse.

I suggest that a subprofessional in a classroom can actually help the teacher improve her communication with the kids. I suggest that a public service professional in health services, through the community health centers that we have now in the South Bronx and in Denver, Colorado, can make intelligible to the poor concepts of public health and preventive medicine which the professionals have not been very successful in imparting to them. And the implications in welfare of what a sub-professional aide can do in terms of communicating with ADC mothers are obvious.

The one goal that I put way near the top is the positive qualitative contribution in communications and understanding that the sub-professional will make. I don't think all of these things are necessarily consistent with all of the others. To some extent, if you emphasize one of these goals, you may detract from another.

F. RIESSMAN: For any social movement, the more pluses it has, the more likelihood it has of catching on. Actually, in our staff report we indicated 5 or 6 goals, or more than the three Dr. Herman indicated.

In the papers that Arthur Pearl has been writing, he argues that there is a significant implication of new careers which has nothing to do with poverty: they will, he says, affect large numbers of people who are not poor.

Dr. Herman's point is very well taken. In evaluating the programs, we have to know in what terms we are evaluating them. For example, if antipoverty strategy is one of the main goals, it has to be evaluated that way. If it is presented as a quality of service program, that has to be evaluated.

In his evaluation, Daniel Yankelovich was very concerned with the effectiveness of the programs in terms of professionals and non-professionals accepting it. His original report did not have much data on service improvement, which Congressman Scheuer was just talking about. I think ultimately we have to show that there is going to be a great improvement in the quality of services, like in birth control, where we now have evidence that nonprofessional neighborhood workers are most effective in influencing large numbers of poor people who thought they didn't want birth control improvement there.

R. CARR: In reviewing the goals and objectives which have been stated so far and reviewing them as an administrator, I would say that all save one are probably within our competence to accept and to resolve. The one exception is the issue of the "establishment" — the influences which would be needed to implement the programs developed in the various agencies, institutions and universities. As forces advocating change are usually far less and as well organized as are the respective "establishments," I think particular attention must be devoted to the development of strategies to overcome actual/anticipated resistance to the new careers movement.

One strategy would be to seek the promulgation of guidelines by the appropriate executive agencies governing utilization of federal funds upon which the respective establishments are becoming increasingly dependent. For example, the desegregation of hospitals in the South and elsewhere was hastened by the "medicare" legislation and guidelines.

With civil service commission; existing in every state and at all levels of government therein (state, county, municipal towns) and numerable professional and technical associations which will have to be involved in order to gain their support, advance the new careers movement now and to implement the programs already inacted and those we will seek to develop, it is imperative that efforts must be made to develop a coordinated and comprehensive plan of action in this regard.

W. DENHAM: In two-and-a-half years of working within this non-professional field, I have been struggling with two kinds of goal perspectives. One is the perspective of the social movement, and the other is the institutional perspective, which relates to the roles most of us have when working in agencies.

The significance of Mr. Scheuer's bill and the experience that we are having around the country, which is essentially demonstrative, is to move into the establishment. And when you move toward welfare organizations, health organizations, and so on, you have to start asking yourself what are your expectations? Are you out to employ people? Are you out to improve the quality and the quantity of the service product?

When you ask those questions, you also have to make some choices. We have found, for example, when we talk about what we have done in job development, our primary consideration is to get those kids into the system by getting them jobs.

F. RIESSMAN: Sometimes the goals permit a remarkable convergence. In New York City now the Board of Education is coming to understand that we are really not going to make smaller classes in the schools, but we are going to put extra personnel in the schools.

Now, this hasn't come about from an employment or an anti-poverty issue. This has come about from a new understanding in the educational establishment that the way to improve education is to change the student/teacher ratio via all kinds of nonprofessional personnel.

Consequently, I think you have a quality of service opening here. Even if I accept it as the main strategy, I would also use it as a way of getting the employment goal into the picture.

The New York Board of Education, in making this move on the ratio issue, thinks right away of 2,000 college students and all that nonsense. Here is where we should raise the question of combining them with other nonprofessionals rather than only college students. The tactical situation allows for a combining of these goals, even if the employment goal is the priority one.

The revolution which is taking place is beginning to demand accountability of social services, and you have the pressure, for example, from the Harlem parents groups. The school system is starting to have to deliver good education, instead of talking about it.

M. HERMAN: Is the latching on to the teacher ratios and putting in the aides not also a convenient way by which the school can "cop out" on doing what it ought to be doing? Like creating more schools and having not forty kids or fifty kids in a class, but maybe two classes of twenty-five each?

I don't think that we ought to take this as an unmixed blessing or as an enormous innovation for better education, because while we may have an agenda as to what we hope to achieve with regard to the use of nonprofessionals, there are other kinds of agendas around, and we have to safeguard against the possibility that nonprofessional programs can be used for other purposes.

Strategy Issues

D. BUSHNELL: Dr. Riessman proposed that some of the professional training institutions offer training in the use of sub-professionals. The Public Health Service, for example, has made some grants to dental training institutions for just that purpose, to set up a course which will train the dentist to use dental aides.

One might expect that this would be a very successful effort, because it can easily be demonstrated that dental aides make it possible for the dentist to handle 3 times as many patients. If they can handle three times as many patients with the hiring of one dental aide, that is a very reasonable return on a modest investment.

They found, however, that few dental schools were willing to establish such courses without continuing grants. There has been no evidence of their accepting this addition to their professional curriculum.

My question to Dr. Riessman is: What strategy would you suggest to get some leverage on these hidebound institutions — such as those that prepare doctors and other professionals?

F. RIESSMAN: In terms of the model which I was presenting before, I think what is required is the uniting of the professionals and the nonprofessional in the dental and other areas, to make this demand and to provide the rationale for it.

So, first I would get together the people who have had positive results with similar programs and make this information known. They should start to argue for it and put it before dental schools who show some interest.

Now, it is certainly possible, as any action strategist knows, that you may be picking the most difficult place to move. If you say it is the most hidebound, I would not move there first.

Lincoln Hospital in the Bronx is moving toward a career aide program in health and they have gotten the medical school, as well as the university, to consider this kind of plan. In such cases, where there is movement forward, one could apply this strategy and not take on the most difficult place at first.

I was very impressed with Congressman Scheuer's point about the police. I wouldn't have known that the police were that responsive to the possibility of using aides, although I know in Richmond, California, they are using them as community law enforcement aides. But if that is the case, then I would make some strategic movement toward that area.

I think the sub-professional movement has gotten a very limited press from the intellectual establishment in the United States. The Congressman gets great press. He got an editorial in the **Times**, and a letter. That is about the best press we have gotten so far, but considering the amount of press — and I really want to be very competitive about it — that the guaranteed annual income gets and that black power gets, a program that seems to be getting somewhere ought to get a similar kind of press.

F. LOGUE: I think one of the real battles will be reform of the Civil Service. Career development for nonprofessionals is held back because of Civil Service laws.

B. RIVKIN: Would the panel favor an amendment to the civil service regulations so there would be no educational tests for employment at the director level or at any level? Too many of our programs now require a Masters Degree in this or a Doctors Degree in that for employment at specified levels. Would the panel favor an amendment to the EOA so there will be no religious, racial or educational achievement levels required for employment in an OEO-funded program?

F. RIESSMAN: I think the Civil Service people are very threatened by the idea that you are going to throw out all their basic requirements and qualifications — literacy requirements and so on. I try to make it clear that I do not want to throw those things out, and stress that the sub-professional program will increase the quality of service in their programs.

The one concession I ask of them is that they permit at least an entry position to be established in any of the health, education, correctional areas, for example, without the usual formal literacy and educational requirements. But if a person wants to move up, either in terms of seniority and increased wages or toward professional status, he should be required to develop the appropriate literacy skills. You are, in short, asking for a time waiver. You are not suggesting that illiterate people become assistant teachers in the classroom. Consequently you start out at the lowest aide position without the traditional requirement. The aide does not have to have a high school diploma or any other degrees but over a specified period of time, he must either acquire literacy of a certain level — ninth grade for example — and/or high school equivalency in order to move up beyond the aide position.

J. FISHMAN: When you attempt to change Civil Service, though, one of the problems that we have come up against is that professionals at the bottom level turn up making salaries that aren't very much above what we are talking about paying non-professionals. There is very little room for steps between an entry teacher and a licensed teacher. An entry teacher makes $5,000 or $5,500, and in some places even less. The practical nurse makes less because a regular nurse makes about $5,500.

F. RIESSMAN: You should become allied with such groups, not competitive with them, by demanding an increase in salaries, all along the line. You can say: "If you are only getting that, that's ridiculous. This new movement will produce, with your assistance and your support, an increase in your salary as well."

CONGRESSMAN SCHEUER: There is some historical basis for this process of pressure from the bottom up. The sub-professionals say to the professionals: "You'd better join with us because we want what you are getting, and if we can get what you are getting, you will have to get more."

There was a big uproar in OEO when they decided that the minimum salary level for hospital workers, for example, should be $1.25. There were plenty of towns in the south that were paying subprofessionals 65¢ an hour, and there was a terrible fear on the part of the hospital administrators. Many cities wouldn't take federal funds which could require them to pay subprofessionals in a hospital $1.25 an hour, because they were afraid of the impact it would have on their own subprofessional wage levels.

Finally, through a combination of stick and carrot, they very reluctantly took it, still fearing that this would have an impact on other local sub-professional wages that they were paying not only in the hospital, but in the grocery store and the drug store. OEO and the Department of Labor knew this was going to happen and were very happy about it, because this is a classic case of spending federal dollars, and affecting the private economy.

In the towns where they accepted these federal funds, it had an immediate impact on wages that were being paid people doing comparable work. We knew this was going to happen and it should happen. The professionals can benefit just as well as other sub-professionals not involved in these programs will benefit.

G. PARKER: Dr. Riessman, the real hangup in the whole movement is the fact that there have not been any careers built into most of the training programs, and the result is that the success of a project is still measured by number of placements. But the success of the new careers movement must be measured by the possibilities of careers beyond placements.

Can you discuss the other strategies that might be employed on the local level to move the various agencies and institutions to accept the notion that there must be something beyond the sub-entry or the entry level position for the nonprofessional?

F. RIESSMAN: There are already a number of programs around the country that have picked up this idea.

For example, in Seattle, Washington, Eugene, Oregon, and in Washington, D. C., there are programs going on, and in the Newark school system, we have developed at least a design, that was accepted locally, to careerize teacher development from an aide, to an assistant, to an associate, all the way up to a regular teacher, with different job requirements, different salaries, different training.

Now, I think this is likely to be accepted at first only on an experimental basis, and I think we have to start that way. In other words, you try to get state licensing groups to at least permit you to do it on a demonstration or experimental basis. So far it hasn't gone that far yet. Jobs have been created, but not training and not careers for the most part.

I think we have to start immediately, and I think federal funds could be very well used to demonstrate the effectiveness of this approach, and I would be more willing to "cream" in this area.

It has been demonstrated by Ellson in Indiana that people without high school diplomas can be trained to monitor remedial reading with as little as 10 hours training. They can play a crucial role in remedial reading for disadvantaged youngsters and demonstrate distinct improvements in their reading. I don't want to produce careers without changes in service quality. So, the demonstration that this can be done is extremely important.

We are going to try at the New Career Development Center at NYU to report this kind of information and its implications. I repeat that the intellectual establishment has very little awareness of these new possibilities. So we must really make known, first of all, that there is an information gap and second, what kinds of things can be done toward careerizing an occupation.

G. BOWMAN: I would like to report a way in which the educational "Establishment" has begun to look at the problem and the potentials of the use of auxiliary personnel.

The National Commission for Teacher Education and Professional Standards of the National Education Association, which is, in essence, the "Establishment" within this field, has established what they call the year of the nonconference, which will be devoted to the teacher and his staff. Rather than calling people together from all over the country and merely reaching a few hundred or a thousand, they are trying to reach many, many thousands of people and encourage them to find out what is happening within their communities by doing a series of life case studies.

They would like to see whether the utilization of aides is of value for pupils. Even if there were no poverty program, even if there were no manpower shortage, they believe that aide utilization has important pupil outcomes. Because the problems in our society are so inter-related, sometimes a solution for one problem may have peripheral benefits, sort of serendipity, for others.

The essential thing is that they are concerned with studying this question with an open mind, in terms of what is actually happening, and this is involving the "Establishment" itself in the interpretation. I think that this is the kind of approach we should publicize, applaud and stimulate in other groups of this kind.

The Controversy Issue

J. CONNORTON: A term like "attack on the establishment" is immediately going to create a good deal of antagonism. There are a lot of people in the field who are looking now for advice and counsel, and I would suggest not an "attack on the establishment," but a cooperative effort, to help solve the problem.

The hospitals, for example, are becoming more and more conscious of their place in the community. We are bound by a lot of rules and regulations: No one can be employed until the age of eighteen, for example. We, unfortunately, are faced with many malpractice suits.

The establishment is very conscious of its obligations. The establishment, if you want to call it such, knows that with Medicare and Medicaid, there will be many new things to provide, and they are looking for paramedical personnel. They are looking to the universities for guidance.

If you start with an attack on the establishment, you are going to end up solidifying some of the resistance of the professionals. I suggest that the use of the carrot is not unknown in the history of dealing with people.

D. YANKELOVICH: The theme of whether these nonprofessional programs should be controversial or noncontroversial is emerging in some of the remarks Dr. Connorton made. I would like to speak in favor of noncontroversy.

A lot of us agree with Congressman Scheuer that there is a direct relationship between the funds that are going to go into this nonprofessional program and the war in Vietnam, and that possibly these funds will be increased if the war is settled. This means we have in the next few years an opportunity for working some of the "bugs" out of the program.

It seems to me that it is very bad strategy to get engaged in controversy if you are weak and if you haven't eliminated some of the worst flaws in the program.

From the point of view of strategy, I would suggest that this umbrella of noncontroversy be used to try to focus on at least two areas of great potential controversy. One is the establishment and its attitude toward this kind of program.

In physicians, the idea of untrained nonprofessionals arouses the deepest anxiety and hostility, quite apart from any "union" type of mentality they may have. Their training in medical schools has pushed them in this direction.

Dr. Riessman mentioned two aspects of training nonprofessionals. One is their upgrading and we find this is a dead-end problem because of the gap in the middle level of training. Also the "creaming" operation, that has admittedly gotten a majority of high school graduates and women, at the same time has developed an ideal core of people who can be trained to fill the gap that now exists between the nonprofessional and what they can become.

The other aspect of training is turning the formal educational system upside down and letting people start in on jobs and get their education along with the jobs. If you don't have provisions both for training and for actual new careers, and you arouse controversy prematurely, you are going to end up precisely at the dead-end you are trying to avoid.

By making the movement militant now, you are bound to abort this movement before it begins.

Another problem related to controversy is the assumption that the program for nonprofessionals is almost totally in the public sector, and therefore one talks about the vast sums of money that will be available to support such programs.

Now, supposing that ultimately you are able to create jobs and careers for millions of people. Should 100 per cent of them be in the public sector? Shouldn't part of them be in the private sector, both through absorption by professionals who are willing to pay for these services and by industry?

What will happen if you have a self-perpetuating nonprofessional program, where, let's say, 50 per cent of the careers are in the private sector? No thought has been given to that at all. The whole political argument against the welfare state, that it subsidizes people who don't deserve to be subsidized, that it creates false jobs, that it subsidizes jobs that should be paid for by industry, is going to make every other controversy seem very small by comparison.

We have a conservative Congress. So, thank goodness, in a sense, that the program is still small scale. Later, when it is ready to move into high gear, controversy might be welcomed, but to precipitate controversy before these two problems are solved I think is a very bad strategic mistake.

F. RIESSMAN: On the question of controversy, there is more than has been expressed. It has been pointed out that Congress is becoming more conservative. I happen to think that the nonprofessional concept has many conservative overtones, as well as very progressive overtones.

Every man is a taxpayer, in relation to the production of these jobs. Conservatives like it very much, because they also want accountability of services and quality services. They are very disturbed by the degeneration of social services.

I am out to win conservatives, and I am not disturbed that Congress is moving in that direction. I think they are more likely to be influenced by a general benefit anti-poverty approach, rather than a Thirties whip up of a lot of noise.

E. LYNTON: I wanted to demur a little on the strategy of avoiding controversy, even to the extent of creaming at the beginning. I think this is the strategy that has been employed. In our observations of the programs, we have found that one of their principal defects, as seen by the potential outside employers, is that nothing really was tested. They always knew, for example, that a high school graduate who had raised successfully a bunch of children and had been active in the PTA, could help a teacher in the care of preschool children. They felt really nothing that they didn't know had been tested, and that all you had done was perhaps add to the numbers of low level jobs or substitute other people for the same jobs.

Unless you move directly on the basic issues, which are hitching up these jobs to permanent career lines in institutions and to testing out whether people without the appropriate credentials can gain competence through forms of experience, you have tested nothing. You have to agree with them that it has been nice, but it doesn't mean anything.

G. GOLDBERG: The noncontroversial aspect of the nonprofessional programs seems to be precisely related to the lack of career mobility built into them. Frustration and militancy develop because — perhaps only temporary at that — jobs and not careers have been offered.

F. RIESSMAN: I am not suggesting that this new movement be traditionally militant. I think there is a place for militancy and a strong statement of things. I discovered personally at the Lincoln project in the Bronx that the nonprofessionals who were frequently quite anti-professional and quite militant were able to get me to see things which nobody else got me to see, and I considered myself on their side.

Conflict is not an entirely negative thing. I think what is going on here is conflict and it is very healthy. There is a lot of difference of opinion on the goals for the movement. I think it is leading to many interesting developments.

I am involved in a debate now with Dr. Richard Cloward and the Welfare Rights movement. They said to me, "Well, why debate? Both movements are good." But they are not equally good, and there are different priorities and it is good to open this up.

One comment about co-opting. It isn't what I have observed around the country at all. Most of the nonprofessionals who were hired were not that militant to begin with.

Some professionals control them and manipulate them, but this does not have to be the pattern, and I don't want to set up the dangerous formulation of nonprofessionals versus professionals. It is nonprofessionals, professionals and their friends against the guildists — people who want to monopolize and police the professions — who are the real enemies. They are clearly people who do not want to change and who will suffer from the new careers movement. I want to make that very clear. It is a multi-group gain, a multi-class gain, but it is not an all-class gain. There are groups in the society who will lose. Small businessmen and the monopolists in the professions are going to lose. Outside of that, I think everybody else has a great deal to gain.

I don't pretend to think everybody gains from this. Within the professional areas, there are people who want no change, very clearly, and you have to deal with them. Don't pretend they can all be persuaded, because they have very definite commitments to old technology, old organizations and the old things that they know, and they equate them with "quality services."

They mistake credentials for quality and for qualification. Credentials are not equivalent to qualification. We have to make very clear that many credentials are credentials for mediocrity.

I think we have to convert the Neighborhood Youth Corps into a new careers model. It can counsel and give meaningful training, not simply keep kids busy and out of trouble.

I don't mean to suggest, because I want multiple goals, that there isn't conflict. I agree with both Dr. Herman and Mr. Denham that there is clearly at various points in the developing of this strategy, specific subconflicts. I don't mean to obscure them or cover them up.

But I don't think you have any choice but to acknowledge that framework and to try to work out those conflicts strategically. I don't think you can avoid the quality of services question by saying you are just for manpower development, because people are going to say you are lowering the quality of education by putting teacher aides in the classroom.

Mr. Yankelovich informs me that in a small percentage of the nine cities sample that they studied, there were hard core nonprofessionals employed. And this small group did about as well as the cream crop in terms of the variables they studied. Again the limitation is they did not study sufficiently service quality. They concentrated on the relationships to professionals.

The population control movement has indicated the use of not especially creamed groups in the South, for example, to indicate a very new kind of quality of service. So there are indicators, despite the massive issue that you raised, that poor people, hard core people, people without much education, can be effectively trained to provide quality service. This we need to demonstrate further in the period ahead.

II. OPERATIONAL EXPERIENCE — PROBLEMS AND ISSUES

Remarks of Mr. William Denham:
"The Howard University Experience"

One of the clear implications of the term "nonprofessional" is to underscore from the outset the occupational status gap between those who have professional credentials and those who don't. Stratification of occupational titles and authority tend to become an end in itself rather than means to the end of increasing the quality and quantity of service.

It seems to me that really effective use of the nonprofessional cannot be realized until the human services field develops greater competence in defining service goals, in terms of problems to be dealt with and the skills and techniques required to deal with them. It would then be possible to identify and select the personnel needed and to be selected primarily on the basis of their capacity to perform essential tasks in a problem solving or a service delivery process, rather than solely on their places in the occupational hierarchy.

I don't have the answer to it, but I think the term "nonprofessionals" is corny, dysfunctional and really gets us into a lot of difficulty when we start talking about job definitions and career lines, etc.

Program Components

Let me briefly mention the main components and the rationale for our program. Its planners saw three major areas of social needs. These were, one, the needs of the socially handicapped youth population for meaningful beginnings or entry employment opportunities leading to jobs with advancement and opportunity to acquire the vocational or technical training requisites for functioning in the world of work.

Two, the need in the human service field for a reservoir of manpower to relieve the staff shortages. Three, the need in this same field to make more effective use of traditional professional and subprofessional personnel through more rational reallocation or distribution of tasks. This leads to the improvement of the quality and quantity of the services rendered, especially to the deprived client population.

Goals

What are the goals of our particular program? One, to develop in socially, economically and educationally deprived youth the necessary motivation, identity, values and capabilities for utilizing the offered training in order to hold an entry job and begin a potential career in a human services field. Two, to enable these youths to acquire the basic personal skills, attitudes and knowledge common to human service occupations, so they may function effectively in these areas. Three, to teach specialized skills, essentially for functioning in at least one kind of human service and, four, to promote the development of entry jobs and career opportunities for aides in human service agencies. This would avoid the failure of many job training programs up to now—namely the production of a trained, but unemployed population.

Structure

The structure or the model of our program is composed of the following elements: One, we try to teach a basic core of practical content through the medium of the core group method. This is designed to equip and develop in the trainee the resources required for understanding the system employing him. Conducting himself in terms of satisfactory work habits and accepting supervisory authority and assuming responsibility for the work role and tasks assigned him. We also try to teach a group of specialized skills for job functioning in a specific role in the particular human service agency.

Three, we place great emphasis in on-the-job training and supervised teaching on the job located in the organizational context in which the person will be employed subsequent to training. This is coupled with a remediation component designed to equip the trainee with the basic literacy skills — reading, writing and arithmetic — necessary for him to function on the job. We orient the remediation not to the ABC's and in the abstract, but to the kind of basic skills he will need in this particular job.

Another element in the training design is constant communication between the training center and the field agency for the purposes of program coordination, assessment, aide evaluation and job development.

We also try, and we have had difficulty in, activating a systematic evaluation of the training program. This includes the structure of design, specific objectives, training competence, measurement devices, on-going feedback and identification and interpretation of outcomes.

Up to now, we have trained approximately 150 aides in a period of two-and-a-half years. The funding has been multiple. It has come primarily from the Office of Juvenile Delinquency and the Department of Labor.

We have trained about 50 teacher aides for the DC school system; 3 geriatric aides, fifteen aides as counsellor aides in the institutional programs of the Department of Welfare; 20 school health aides for the DC Health Department; a detached worker for the Recreation Department in Washington; and the first group of neighborhood nonprofessional organizers for the local poverty effort in Washington.

Basic Issues

Let me identify some of the issues that I believe have evolved for us out of this experience.

The issues, as we have seen them, have come from the perspective of an outside trainer. We have been training **for** systems. We haven't been training **within** systems. This leads, in turn, to what I think is one of the major problematic areas that we have encountered; namely, the whole area of job development.

I believe that the locus of the job development effort, whether it is external to the system or internal, makes a lot of difference, primarily in terms of the extent of control of the trainer oriented job developer. Especially, in terms of the extent to which we can exercise control over crucial decisions dealing with job development. Such decisions as the kind of jobs that can be defined and trained for, and also the question of the commitment of resources of money for salaries, training facilities and personnel.

As a consequence, the kind of job development techniques and tactics that we have used fall into the areas of persuasion, cajoling, and education. We have not been in a position to control the major decisions. This has led to a great deal of difficulty.

I think also the fact that we are external to the employing agency has made a subtle effect on our own commitment. I think our commitment is primarily to job development from the perspective of the trainee, the nonprofessional. We want to get him a job with upward mobility. I think our orientation has been less to the organizational needs of the agency.

One of the issues that we have to really come face to face with is it is much easier to develop jobs with upward mobility in a Community Action Agency than in an established agency.

I will just mention some of the issues on which we can elaborate. I am not at all sure at this point whether we are clear about two kinds of populations, if you will. One is the population of nonprofessionals who are available for work and the "population" of nonprofessional jobs.

I don't think either one is a homogeneous mass. I think there is probably a range of nonprofessional candidates, ranging from what we call the hard core to the so-called upwardly mobile poor. I think we have to align our recruitment with a range of nonprofessional jobs.

In a sense, we are going to have to develop two sets of typology — typology of candidates and typology of nonprofessional jobs.

I think the whole question of the problem of salaries is a crucial one. Our salary range for nonprofessionals in Washington is probably pretty close to the national norm, $3,700 to $4,200. A lot of these kids have family responsibilities. They are kids, but support a family of two or three on $3,700.

I mention this so that we will not overromanticize the nonprofessional concept in trying to extract a kind of magic in the service part of the job, in contrast to the kind of reality needs that have to be met. People must have adequate salaries. We must be sure that the salary paid nonprofessionals is competitive and gives them a chance to meet their basic needs.

I think also that in our zeal to build in career lines, one, two, three, four and five, that we don't do it exclusively for the sake of the career and the new job structure, but we do it to deliver a more effective and efficient kind of service to people. Let's not get caught up in the magic of the career structure for its own sake.

Remarks of Mrs. Sally Jacobson
"The Lincoln Hospital Experience"

Our operation takes place within a very highly formalized institutional structure, which is the Albert Einstein College of Medicine, affiliated with a municipal hospital, Lincoln Hospital. Until now, our experience has been in training people for a component part of our program, a neighborhood service center operation, funded by the Office of Economic Opportunity. It might be said that these people were perhaps less trained than they were oriented to get on the job as quickly as possible. Their training occupied a period of roughly four to six weeks, and then they continued to receive some in-service training during their service performance.

We have just recently received a grant from the NIMH to allow us the luxury of time in trying to develop a model training program, so that we can begin to really examine a lot of the problems in training. For the first time, we are now training people to possibly place them outside of our own organization, although we assume at the end of nine months, we will probably want to hold on to some of them, although we hope many of them will spin off.

I am grateful to Mr. Denham for stating the goals of his program and the curriculum, because they approximate closely many of our goals and our curriculum as well. We take people into training who come from our community by and large and are indigenous to that community and are poor for the most part. We really see the community in a microcosm; we see what it really means to engage with some aspect of the community, in terms of the establishment.

This morning we heard about some of the global issues that preoccupy us, and we have tried to look upon these as implications for training. We try to deal with the academic issues in terms of selection, training methodology, assessment of learning, job performance; in a more substantial way, to deal with the impact which results from the participation of the poor. That is, we are employing people from the community as workers in our program and one of our concerns is to study the effect on an institution such as a college of medicine when such a community-based program is introduced.

Training Issues

Even in a short period of time, we have seen some rather significant impact. There have been some changes in the nature of resident training, in that we have residents who are now coming down to Lincoln and requesting to spend part of their first year residency with us, their second year residency, their third year residency, to think about group care and departs from the traditional medical model of service.

Further, we assess what happens to our workers. The nonprofessional worker, especially if he is from a lower socio-economic or minority group frequently is a person bent on leaving that group, and this motivation to social movement upwards affects some of his most basic attitudes toward the very people with whom his job will put him in daily contact. These attitudes are manifested mostly toward people who are mentally ill, who are poor, who are members of families whose structures are not normal or desirous and who are experiencing problems with authority.

An essential part of any training program is the creation in the trainee of an awareness of the elements of his own behavior that indicates the existence of some of these basic attitudes. These attitudes frequently manifest themselves in the trainee's and in the worker's apparent overidentification with the agency or service that employs him and his concomitant underidentification with clients.

This tendency can, to some extent, be counteracted by stressing to the trainee and workers the service function of his job and the service goals of the organization for which he works. Service in this sense is seen as a two-way process which, while it serves the needs of the client population, can also be rendered effectively because of the special skills and knowledge possessed by the nonprofessional workers dealing with the population.

Issues of confidentiality arise. A mental health service is preoccupied with this much more so than other kinds of services. The information given the nonprofessional worker by clients is subject to conflicting claims on his loyalty. On the one hand, he is obligated to reveal much of this information to professionals and officials at agencies and services to which he refers the client's problems. On the other hand, the nonprofessional, because of his background, frequently harbors a mistrust of the authority represented by the agencies and services, and this mistrust manifests itself in the nonprofessional's reluctance to supply the agency or service with certain information important to dealing with their clients' problems.

The training program must emphasize and establish the basic trust of the nonprofessional in the maintenance of the strictest confidentiality regarding such information on the part of agencies or services. This process doesn't occur overnight. It requires positive experience at the hands of agencies by the nonprofessionals. However, the framework upon which the nonprofessional eventually establishes such a trust can be supplied during the training period by exposure to a variety of the types of professional agencies and services to which he will refer clients' problems.

Related to the issue of confidentiality is the nonprofessional's attitude toward the acceptance of formal authority. His frequent refusal to turn to authority in situations of stress is apparently because of his inability to recognize that many problems can best be dealt with by the dispensation and delegation of authority.

In this context, the nonprofessional sees the authoritarian aspect of authority. This often features a view of what he has known as the power structure. His training should stress the fact that in his job, he will become identified with the positive aspects of authority. Indeed by virtue of the job, he has become a representative, in some sense, of positive authority.

His job, because it is a service function rendered for individual people with individual problems, puts a face on faceless authority. He is helping his neighbors climb from the level of poverty of which he has been a member, and he is in a position to help these people, because of his authority and his access to and reliance on the authority represented by his own and other agencies and services.

Actually, the nonprofessional most often come to authority for its functional assets rather than its status associated with authority. This then leads to his inability to use authority with comfort. In training, it is important to provide the trainee with role playing situations where error is possible and not disastrous, situations that stress to him that the use of authority requires knowledge and information on his part.

The nonprofessional, when he gets his training, is frequently somewhat more realistically optimistic about the effect he and the agency or service which employs him will have on the problems of the client community and society. This optimism, when counteracted by the lack of effect of dramatic progress, indeed often when met by nothing more than the real facts of the person or social problem, can, in turn, lead the nonprofessional to overpessimism.

Both states of mind are the products of the nonprofessional's lack of long-term experience with the problems he will face on the job. It is here that the professional, especially during the training period, can serve the nonprofessional by providing him with the perspective of reality. Reality, however, should not be presented cynically or with the air of weary fatigue. This should not be discouraging, but should be related to specific reasonable signposts of progress. The emphasis here should not be unreasonable, nor ultraconservative and not radical.

Problems

One of our greatest problems now with people who have been in our neighborhood service center program for a year-and-a-half is what you begin to see as a kind of burned out quality — a sense that they have invested all this time in the neighborhood service center working with clients and where do they go from here? Certain parts of it are certainly due to the fact that they haven't seen any opportunity for upgrading with this particular job situation.

Lastly — the nonprofessional worker frequently finds himself at odds in relationship to the professional personnel at the agency or service which employs him. He often resents their authority, their continuity of experience, their reasons for extracting the elements of problems. This is all ideally realized in order to deal with them, and this is at variance with the nonprofessional style.

The nonprofessional is often unsure of where he stands in the structure of the agency or service with regard to the professional. This insecurity can manifest itself in a breakdown of communication between the nonprofessional and his professional supervisor. The training program can aid in offsetting these negative situations by emphasizing to the nonprofessional the role his job will play in the structure of the agency or service, the dependence of the professional staff on information given to it, and the rights which are his as a member of the agency or service team.

During the training period, the nonprofessional should be introduced to professional staff members in terms of their functions. Their exchanges should be face to face in personal conversations and founded on the fact that as members of the team, they will assist one another in dealing with problems.

The inherent position the aide occupies with respect to the professional has reinforced his feelings of low man on the totem pole. This does not mean to suggest that he is not initially pleased by his acceptance into the system, and that they are not quick to make their new status as a community mental health worker known to their peers in the neighborhood, and their families, but necessarily these factors have all had a major impact on the learning process. This is most clearly seen in supervisory sessions, which are frequently experienced as judgmental situations.

It is also true that some professionals engaged in training indigenous personnel are subject to conflicting emotions and attitudes. The professioal role must necessarily be a supportive one; whereas, in the past, in the didactic situation, his role has been one of direct intervention. The professional's tendency to get at facts, to plan a course of action, may be threatened by the nonprofessional's more spontaneous and informal mode of behavior. In short, the usual didactic process and administrative practice will not serve in a training situation for nonprofessionals.

Remarks of Mrs. Anita Vogel:
"The Mobilization for Youth Experience"

One of the first and most successful of a wide variety of useful programs that we have run has been the two groups we have placed in hospital settings.

Placing youngsters in work crews in hospitals has really given them the best of a crew experience, along with the best of an OJT experience, because the youngster is getting the support and the supervision of a MFY supervisor and yet is under day-to-day direct supervision of hospital personnel in real work settings and performing tasks where quality of performance is expected and where he knows he is necessary.

MFY has been screening the youngsters, but the final decision on selection has rested with the hospital. Youngsters have had to be literate and they have had to be acceptable to the hospital personnel department. What has happened has been that the hospitals have really found the young people we have placed there have done well and a great many of them have been hired, **and there has been upward mobility.**

Our best example of upward mobility was a young lady who started out in MFY with a menial kind of job and then went to be a nurse's aide and then became part of the directing group of their family planning unit. At this time she is in a "semi-professional" position in our training program for adults where she becomes, therefore, a role model for the adults as to how upward mobility can take place.

As a result of the really effective work that the youngsters did at Gouverneur Hospital, several years ago the Medical Director became very excited about the possibility of meeting the need for new kinds of work that should be done by a hospital in a low-income area. MFY and Governeur have cooperated in designing training for local adults in two new health occupations. One we have called social service technician and the other home care technician.

Goals

The goals of this program, are, one, to solve the shortage of professional hospital and health personnel; two, to give adult heads of families now living in poverty new opportunities to develop skills and find socially useful employment and, three, to improve health care in a low-income area by creating two new work roles which can bridge the gap between hospital professional staffs and patients.

The question is are these conflicting goals? We asked that this morning. I think not. I think we can do them all.

The last goal we have written into this program — we are funded jointly by OEO and the Labor Department — is for this to become a prototype, whereby we develop techniques for designing other new occupations.

The social service technicians have basically three functions — patient relations, health visiting and serving as social service aides. Among the functions these people are trained to do are setting the patient at ease, getting him to the proper kind of care within the hospital, within the clinic, and to outside referral, spotting problems that need attention, accompanying the public health nurse, for example, to a Spanish-speaking home, doing follow-up visits concerning medical regimen.

The second occupation is home care technician. I must admit to you now we have not yet trained any home care technicians. We ran into a problem in the beginning. We had decided we would pay differential salaries for these two occupations. We would regroup people, and after a ten week prevocational period, it would be decided who would be one and who would be the other. But nobody wanted to be trained for what looked like a lesser status, lesser paid position, and so nobody wanted to be a home care technician.

Training Procedures

We also have run into a bit of difficulty in actually structuring the curriculum of these two occupations simultaneously, because we really had to build curriculum from the ground up. We were ready to train three groups of twenty trainees and we decided we would concentrate with the first group on the social service technicians. We think we no longer need to set a differential salary goal, because hospital rates of pay have gone up.

We are trying to integrate real vocational content with a considerable emphasis on: How does one function in the community and what does one need to know to work with clients.

We are doing this in a classroom setting. We are giving basic communication skills. At the same time, the trainees are getting three mornings a week in the prevocational period of actual practical work in the hospital, and so far, it seems to work very well. We have a combination of demonstration staff and actual hospital staff members who were there before doing the teaching.

For example, the director of social service at the hospital is teaching some of the social service work. One of the nurses at the hospital is coming in and teaching a unit in public health. Some of our own staff are teaching units, seminars, etc., and we have our own remediation teacher who has been extracting from the kinds of work that the trainees are expected to do in the vocational part of the classroom situation, the communication skills and following her instructions on the basis of that.

Recruitment and Selection

We recruited three ways. We have done a substantial interviewing job of a cross-section of the community, and out of seven hundred interviews of all kinds of people, our research staff selected 340 who looked like good candidates. Some of them were self-referrals. Some have been sent from other community agencies, and some have been gotten from group visits to other places.

The final candidates were screened for basic functional literacy. We randomly selected a hundred and sent out cards to them inviting them to come for interviews. We got forty-five replies. Out of those forty-five replies, we selected the first twenty trainees.

They had to be poverty level in income. We judged on the basis of interviews that they had an interest in people and personality traits that would enable them to deal with people with problems. We used the previous experience in the interview to give us this judgment, and we set sixth grade literacy as a requirement. Where we deviated in the literacy requirement and relaxed on that we were in trouble. That seemed to be the main problem that we have had.

We ended up with six high school graduates, ten people with some high school education and one who had not completed grade school. Five of the twenty were welfare cases. Fourteen were heads of households. Five of them were males. The males are having the hardest time staying in the program and being able to do the kind of work that is required.

Agency Relationships

What are the problems in working directly with another institution? Actually, Mobilization for Youth and Beth Israel Hospital are running this program jointly. It took us three months to arrive at a sensible agreement as to how this program would be supervised. The program supervisor would be responsible to Mobilization to see that the program was carried forward, but when it came to patient care and supervision of training, he must be responsible to the hospital. We finally agreed that we would jointly select the program supervisor and he would have the actual responsibility. Believe it or not, it is working out.

The hospital has guaranteed provision of training. We are now able to place the trained people on OJT situations, and at Gouverneur Hospital, where they have done their prevocational OJT, we now have a situation where the Social Service Department wants some of our trainees and we haven't enough. Where we are trying to place them in other parts of the Beth Israel complex, there is much more of a wait-and-see attitude. "We think we want them. We are glad to try them out, but we will see how well they do."

The staff at Gouverneur, I must say, was extremely skeptical. I have a document here that shows they really expected only minimal work from our trainees before they began, and yet our trainees have become sensitive enough even in the first ten weeks, so that one of them spotted an intended suicide. Another was able to go along with a public health nurse to a home, and because of his receptiveness to a rather disturbed family, he was able to elicit the fact that the patient was not following the diet regimen and for weeks the public health nurse hadn't known it. They are functioning.

Problems

The main problem, as we see it, is the expectation or guarantee of placement after training. We say that we will be able to demonstrate in an institution what a trainee can do in an on-the-job situation, and then we think they will sell themselves if they are well trained and if they are the right people for the job.

The second cycle we are hoping to place outside the Beth Israel complex, because they are accepted within Beth Israel. The challenge of the Scheuer Amendment and Civil Service jobs, before you ever begin a training program, we see as an enormous problem. It is going to be a "show-me" attitude, prove to me it works and then we will take your people.

The problems with the home care technician seem to stem from the requirements of regulations as to what a home health aide is and isn't allowed to do with and without supervision, directly by a nurse. I would like to point out that we find an absolute need for a social worker to work with these trainees around a variety of problems. They are conscientious people, but they are beset with legal problems, family care problems, welfare difficulties.

In the first four weeks, 8 per cent absenteeism was caused by a breakdown of the child care arrangements they made. Their baby sitter didn't come or the baby sitter's kids were sick, and an essential ingredient, if you are going to deal with heads of households in low-income communities, is what are you going to do with their kids? Otherwise you are not going to be able to make them employable.

I think we have to recognize that this can be a way up and out of poverty for people who have common sense, if they are well trained. They don't have to be high school graduates. This particular program is appropriate for some people and other people can't do it at all. Some of the things the kids are doing are much more appropriate for a different level — maintenance jobs and other kinds of hospital jobs — but this particular social service technician is a challenging assignment.

We think our people will really learn to do it, and we think there should be a first rung on a ladder for them, that they should be able to head for high school equivalency and go forward, not necessarily becoming just like their supervisor, but establishing an occupation that stands in its own right.

How far down in the educational scale one can go we don't know yet. We have one little experiment, and I can't tell you how it is going to work out yet. We have a separate little group that seems to have all the abilities to function excepting they don't speak English well enough. We are trying to give them pretraining in English before we get them into the training program.

Someone has asked me do you think they have learned English more slowly because they relate to other people more slowly, and I don't know yet. I know they are not getting stipends the way the others are getting stipends, and we don't have the incentive for them to come to classes regularly. We have five of them we think may make it. I think this would be a way into training in English for non-English speaking people, if we can prove it out.

I think the timetable, though, for placing people in jobs, especially in Civil Service, is one that I would beg the funding agencies and anybody who can help us to give serious thought to, because if we are expected to spend the time of staff going around and doing the negotiating that is going to be required to get people into jobs in a variety of institutional places, please recognize that those same people cannot be doing the kind of supervision that they have to be doing to make sure that training takes place, and, therefore, if it looks as though a demonstration needs a lot of personnel, it does. Either that or you've got to give us several years time in order to prove that the program works.

DISCUSSION

Problems of Salary Levels

R. LEEDS: Mr. Denham mentioned the necessity of beginning the entry jobs at a fairly decent rate of pay. He said that I think at least $3,200 or $3,700 jobs were insufficient to allow a poverty family to really function. At the same time, this morning Congressman Scheuer mentioned the fact that cities were having a lot of difficulty paying its personnel.

Now, given the fact, I think, that currently, in New York City, for example, there are many positions — existing positions — which pay quite little, between $4,000 and $5,000, for instance for the position of institutional aide, would not, therefore, the creation of entry jobs result in these entry jobs being very low paid jobs? Would it not be structurally constrained in the way the systems operate that these new career jobs would actually be utilized by city governments as a way of creating perhaps what one might call a dual Civil Service system, to create a shadow, public administration, if you will, of low paying jobs?

Would this not make this whole project very controversial if those unions which represent city employees at this time view the whole new careers concept as a fancy label for just providing very cheap labor for the city and, at the same time, the city saying that public services are being maintained?

W. DENHAM: I can't say anything except to agree with you. There is a risk certainly of establishing the shadow system you talk about, but I think that this subject certainly suggests that in terms of the field of administration you need to involve — in any effort to develop a new career line — some of the power figures in the Civil Service Commission — you have to involve them very early in the game and very intimately and, of course, the representatives of trade unions.

A. VOGEL: I would like to comment in two ways. First of all, let me start by saying this was a very real problem that concerned us when we began designing our program, because we figured at this point hospital wages were pretty low, and we had been thinking about this as a nurse's aide kind of thing and that was ridiculous, because the nurse and the nurse's aide were getting so little that we couldn't see any sense in starting it.

One of the first things we did was to talk to the head of the union that was concerned with the hospital where we were going to train these trainees. Believe it or not, that's how we found the answer to our salary problem, because he looked at the proposal and said it was very well formulated. You are training people in the Social Service Department and the social service salaries in this hospital are such that you can begin above poverty level. Put a social service technician in an entry job at $4,500, and there will still be a proper differential between that and the next level in the hospital, and with the cooperation of the union, therefore, we arrived at a sensible solution.

I will say we have talked to the New York City Civil Service Commission just last week about the possibility of eventually getting certification and getting some recognition in Civil Service lines, and the Civil Service Commission is thoroughly aware of the problem that was just pointed out. I don't think they have any solutions, but I think they are completely conscious of the fact. In fact, I know they are, that they wouldn't dare try to create what looks like cheap labor, because they would run head on with the unions and they don't want to.

J. D. GRANT: Here is where I feel that organized labor is completely missing the boat and we are completely missing the boat if we can't get with them. Organized labor, as long as it tries to concentrate its strategy on defending the jobs that it now controls, which are, by and large, the jobs that are being automated, it will become a completely defensive game, until they go out of existence.

Now, the professionals don't have that luxury. We can't, even if we want to, just play it cool until we go out of existence. Perhaps labor can. It seems to me what labor ought to be doing is working like mad to get in this professional field game, because it is here where manpower is going to be involved. Here is where the negotiating is going to go on. Here is where they can expand their membership. They ought to be working desperately with us to get as many new members as possible and to expand their organizations.

I would not worry too much about the initial wage now. I'd negotiate over this as well as I could, but I think the trick is to get nonprofessionals into the system, and then to put on the pressure to negotiate about that system. I think that once we get them into the system, they are part of the same game, and we need the support of labor to help us do this.

G. HODGES: I think that is a very good statement. I think everyone knows that Civil Service salaries are set in accordance with the Classification Act, which sets two schemes. One is for white collar and professional and clerical types called the GS system. It goes from GS-1 up to GS-18. Then there are the blue collar types, the trades, and so on. These are set based on the prevailing wage rate in each locality.

When we hire, we are bound to slot the jobs into one of these systems in accordance with the duties of the job, and this is a pretty set scale. It is a good scale. It works out well, but we are bound to follow it. We've got to pay according to systems.

Notice the salaries on the lowest entry level that we have, which aren't bad. Actually, these are the salaries for a GS-1. The rates for Wage Board-1 in the New York City area are considerably higher, so high that we wouldn't even show them on the announcement. Because again, you know, we don't want every middle-class boy filing for the openings. Maybe our strategy was wrong, but we were worried about that. Those who get jobs as apprentice stagehand and so on will be getting as much as $10 a week more than GS-1. I think a similar classification system prevails in most state systems.

General Operational Issues

J. FISHMAN: I'd like to go through three areas very briefly that have been touched upon today and deliberately try to confront you with some problems. I think we all agree this morning that we believe in New Careers and we want to make it a success.

Number one, if you spend so much time in recruitment and selection, without having first gone through the process of really evaluating, with objective data, what it is you are recruiting and selecting for and what biases are going into this, don't you wind up skimming off the cream, the upwardly mobile poor, on the top, who can get jobs anyway? Don't you wind up selecting people who reflect your image of what people like that should be and shouldn't be able to do?

We have yet, after the investment of a great deal of time and money, to come up with some reliable way of selecting who is going to be good and who isn't going to be good, except by selecting people who are going to meet our own image, who basically we like and in which our bias is invested.

Don't we have to deal more with the issue of trying on an experimental basis not to select and recruit the best, but to screen people and then see what happens, rather than screen them out and then decide? We are pretty happy with our selections because they have stayed in. This is a major issue if we are talking about employment from the point of view of the poor and upward mobility.

We have to talk about fitting jobs to people, rather than always fitting people to existing jobs which have been structured on a basis quite other than the needs of people. This is a very important issue for this whole approach.

I am not suggesting that any person can do anything, but rather that our criteria are still heavily laden with the prejudices and stereotypes of the professional human service person.

The second issue is this. Although I have heard a lot of grandiose statements about future perspectives, the fact is we haven't done very much, haven't done anything, about the kind of upward mobility that we are talking about.

The point is how do we build mobility into the regular agencies of the community and not Mobilization for Youth and Lincoln Hospital and Howard University grant programs. How do you build, into the structured existing agencies that are going to be carrying the burden for the next few generations, the ladder and also how do you build in the training in the commuity that is going to allow people to move up that ladder?

When I say training, then we've got another problem. Who is going to do the training? Is it going to be totally in-service training? Are we going to rely on the people who get grants to do training or are we going to begin talking about institutionalizing the training in the educational institutions of the community — the high school and the community colleges? This is a critical issue to the whole concept of New Careers. Without that, you've got entry level employment in which a person is entering, rather than being able to be pushed up. It is dead ended. I challenge the whole thing with this issue, because it is the critical issue.

The third point has got to do with the critical problem of how you negotiate with the legitimate existing permanent institutions in the community for structuring jobs, particularly structuring jobs on a ladder basis, not just the entry jobs. How do you begin to do this important job development task, which has a lot of other implications, in terms of the transition from entry level to the second level to the third level into the subprofessional-professional categories.

I think we know that you can employ the poor to do these things. We know that you can sometimes get these jobs. It is these three issues that we have to deal with if we are to go any further than we are in this meeting.

Selection

S. KESTENBAUM: Dr. Fishman talked about the fact that when we were selecting aides and when we were screening them, we tended to look for people who seemed to reflect our own image. I have some feeling that in defining the jobs that they do, we also define them in our professional image, that we ask aides to do a part of what the professional was doing, while at the same time most of us, I think, had serious question about what it is we were doing and we questioned really the efficacy, for example, of the client-worker problem, the individual approach to clients, and yet we had people in the social services system who do the intake, do the initial clearing, to make the home visit, all of which were just fancy names for doing the same thing.

H. KRANZ: Two questions. One, on looking from the demand side for professional aides, or have any of you found that race is an important factor? Is race important in your thinking and in your use of professional aides?

The second question. Which is more important — selection of the people or training of the people? In Project CAUSE, we found that selection was quite important. Have you had any reaction to that question?

S. JACOBSON: In our area, which the Southeast Bronx, our population is substantially Puerto Rican, roughly about 55 per cent, and Negro, 25 to 30 per cent, so that we were very specific in recruiting people. We were looking for Puerto Rican and Negro people.

We had some interesting consequences of that, because after the program began and we had thirty-odd people within it, a number of people began to make comments about it and felt we should make a very deliberate attempt to start recruiting people who were non-Negro and non-Puerto Rican. They saw it as an implication of some degrading of the position, that we were only employing minority group members.

As far as selection, we put an enormous emphasis on selection. We have a very specialized selection process, which puts a lot of time and effort into group interviewing of small groups. They are screened by having a discussion with one or two members of staff, and they sit in a one-way room, and behind the one-way mirror sits a number of judges, which includes both professional and nonprofessional members of staff, and hopefully they are rated on a number of dimensions, which are supposed to be valid and reliable.

We are now trying to evaluate. There are times when we feel if we just took any dozen or two dozen people at random, maybe we would come up with the same thing, but our experience so far has been that we have selected carefully and we have selected a pretty good group.

Unlike Mrs. Vogel's experience, not one man has left our program and half of our personnel are male. We put a lot of effort into recruiting men, because this was an enormous problem, since they identified this job initially as very feminine oriented.

New Careers and Upward Mobility

M. HERMAN: Dr. Fishman, just to sharpen the issue, I think you do some violence to the argument by equating new careers with the utilization of nonprofessionals. These are somewhat different notions and I think have to be logically separated. I don't make the demand that every constructive use of nonprofessionals has to lead to a new career. First of all, I don't think it is practicable. Are you not putting an inordinately heavy burden upon what it is that we think we are getting under way with the utilization of nonprosionals by putting on each and everyone of them the demand that it meets a new career model. It may be that the new career model is only relevant for a very small portion of jobs for nonprofessionals in human services.

J. FISHMAN: Let's distinguish between the demand on the community and the demand on the individual nonprofessional.

I believe the nonprofessional idea is synonymous with the New Careers idea when talking from the viewpoint of need. There is the need to structure in the community the opportunities, the resources and the supports, so that individuals who have the motivation can move up, just as people who come from middle-class backgrounds and having the usual education have the opportunity and the structure and the built-in supports to move up. Not all of them do, but there is the opportunity and that is what we are talking about.

The only way of getting this opportunity is to make it part of the educational structure of the community and part of the job structure of the community. If you don't have that, then what you've got is, in effect, 4,975,000 people at an entry level for the rest of their lives — knowing it, being aware of it — being concerned with it — and we haven't really changed what we are talking about changing.

S. JACOBSON: We are involved now in negotiations to establish a Health Careers Institute, which involves the City University of New York and the State University of New York and the health services in the City. We will begin in January the planning and staff development phase of this operation, which will follow through pretty much what you heard this morning at an entry level kind of core training. Then you train technicians within any of the various health subspecialties, including mental health.

There will be an opportunity to go into a junior college two-year associate arts program, with a step up in terms of the kind of job description that still has to be developed. From there you can go into the four-year college system and so on into the professions, in terms of whether it is an MS or Ph.D., clinical psychologist or an MD physician, and that this is presently the structure which has evolved.

R. A. NIXON: I think this is a very important subject and we have to give a lot more thought to it and probably make a much more sophisticated description of what it is we are talking about.

For one thing, of course, idealistically, everyone agrees with the desirability of a ladder concept, a career concept and big upward mobility, but I think we have to be careful not to set up an unrealistic concept here which introduces such an almost alien potential that it becomes a barrier for the program itself.

The fact that you don't have a great big ladder doesn't mean that every entry job is just a dirty deadend job. There is some kind of middle ground in this. It seems to me we have to recognize that most of the working class don't live and work day by day, month by month, on a great big ladder. They are doing a good salaried job, getting a decent rate of pay, but they are not striving and driving and going right on up. I think we have to be careful not to establish something that is really not actual in the American labor market.

Furthermore, one subject we really don't ever talk about in this is — if you really got a big ladder and you begin to talk about going up to becoming doctors and that sort of thing — then you'd better talk about seventy-million other people who are stuck in some kind of rigidified job classification, underemployment or something or other — whom we don't ordinarily think about when we talk about this nonprofessional opening — who, if opportunities are really opened up, might well be interested.

As long as we are talking about nonprofessional openings for disadvantaged people, and if we are particularly talking about them for disadvantaged youth, we do need to avoid giving them an absolute deadend characteristic at the beginning, but we must not set up unrealistic expectations of a ladder character. Otherwise we are just dreaming and we will put barriers in the way of realization of the potential of the program.

H. KRANZ: I think the crucial issue is to create more and more subprofessional jobs and take many of the people in poverty out of the "no" jobs or very, very inadequate jobs into these entry-level positions. Then let's also talk over a period of time on how we can build promotion into these things — I can't see a surgeon from a nurse's aide.

A. VOGEL: If we have taken people in poverty, on welfare, and been able to give them a beginning of some genuine skill, that seems to me step one of a very big job, and for some of these people this may be as far as they will ever get.

I think what we are saying is that we need to work on the institutions like Civil Service and the school systems and community colleges to create additional opportunities for those who want them, but I think here somebody is saying let's not apply so much pressure to the individual, that everybody is going to feel that if he doesn't go from here to here to here to here he is a failure.

I think these are two distinct things. One is the opportunity that we create within a community for advancement for those who are willing to improve their educational level, and I am not so worried really about this kid. If he gets as far as a good community worker and he becomes literate and gets a high school equivalency, there are seven other jobs he can do, because there are different careers open to him.

I am worried if we don't improve his literacy, we don't encourage him for the high school equivalency and we don't give him the basic skills so that he can do half-a-dozen different jobs.

B. HILL: I was going to say that I don't think we have to think about the careers concept in an either/or way; that is, restricted to mobility from, let's say, a nurse's aide up to a full professional nurse. It could be, it seems to me, both a vertical and horizontal kind of mobility. And in the training programs, what we need to do is to prepare people for both kinds of mobility; to help them move up, if this is necessary and if it is desirable. It is just quite conceivable that once you get into a given job or sphere of endeavor, that maybe you won't want to move straight up, but you might want to move in a horizontal direction. It seems to me that in the training, that this kind of thing should be taken care of, and particularly if you are talking about the hard core. You need to train for multiple kinds of skills and not just training in one area.

That is the thing that concerned me. I think that's the reason why someone said something to the effect that many of them are going to be satisfied where they are. I am not sure that that is true. I think the reason for the lack of interest and the desire to move up in a lot of these people is the fact that they don't have the wherewithall to move to the first step.

I think once anybody gets to the first step, they are very rarely satisfied at that point they want to move up, and the job that we have to do is to create in them the capacity of moving up. It should be a general developmental kind of thing.

R. MAITLANDI: I think the group might be interested in a new model that I just found out about. Clarion State College in Clarion, Pennsylvania has developed a program of evaluation with the local school districts in its region. The Elementary Secondary Education Act Title I requires that all school districts evaluate their Title I programs. The ability to accomplish a proper evaluation by many school districts does not exist. Most school districts contract outside agencies to do the evaluation or just do not fulfill this requirement.

The staff of Clarion State College have encouraged the local school administration to develop their Title I proposals with a provision to train a staff both professional and non-professional in teams. The training of this staff to conduct the evaluation for the school districts by Clarion State College creates additional employment opportunities for non-professional and professional personnel.

Their new model is going to be training entirely by research teams. This goes all the way from the clerical person to the technical, the semi-professional and the professional. At the top of the team is graduate students that are being trained, all the way on down to nonprofessionals in the sense of which most of us have been talking.

The interesting thing is — not only is the college going to train them as a team but they are going out into the schools as a team and they will be functioning as a team within the schools at the same time while they are working. They can move horizontially or upward, and the college will continue for those who want to move.

Now, I think it does more than just offer the employment potent for upward and across. The sociologists who are here today know that as long as it is possible, it is like a system by itself, but if you are in there with a team support you can probably make it in the system. I think it is worth watching this model.

G. BOWMAN: First, In Detroit, they had for a number of years utilized so-called "school aides" who did merely task-oriented jobs, not people-oriented jobs. They did typing and bulletin boards and the like. They believed that some of these aides could do more, so they established a hierarchy of jobs with a wage scale for each step. Then they selected forty aides who had been operating as school aides and gave them a summer training program with a practicum, in order to find out what they could do directly with the pupils — what they could do to be helpful in supporting the learning—teaching profess.

At the conclusion of six weeks of summer training, they placed these aides at the second level and continued their in-service training. So, this was all part of a plan. They involved Wayne University in the training.

Puerto Rico made a somewhat similar approach. The school system itself had decided that they were going to undertake this in a planned step-by-step method. They selected fifty aides and have had the University of Puerto Rico do their summer training and with the agreement that in the fall, they would be placed in the school system at the entry level. Those who merited it would be given opportunity for a work-study program at the University of Puerto Rico.

They report now that all fifty aides did qualify for this work-study program at the University of Puerto Rico and, therefore, they are on the way upward to the second level.

So, when the school system really sets out a plan and then involves the universities in implementing it, it can be done.

Job Development Problems
New Functions

A. VOGEL: What we are trying to do is something a little different. Whether we are succeeding we will know more about later. So far we seem to be. The notion of the new people placed in the hospital setting in these nonprofessional, if you will, categories is that they are doing jobs that nobody was doing before.

In other words, we have, as an example, created a unit of people who start at intake to meet the patients at intake, which nobody ever did before, and take that patient at intake, if there are three kids with the mother, the kids get taken care of. That patient-relations person is responsible for seeing that the patient, when he comes into the hospital, gets where he is supposed to go, gets the kind of service he is supposed to get, understands what the doctor has to say. At the same time the patient relations person is being trained to carry on a dialogue with the patient who comes in, so that if there are problems that the hospital personnel have been too busy to spot, this person is able to identify them and see that they are taken care of.

S. KESTENBAUM: You just make a leap to see that they are taken care of. That assumes that the hospital can take care of those problems.

A. VOGEL: Yes, it does, and so far what has happened has been — well, a couple of examples. A patient came in, and in the course of conversation with the patient-relations person who was functioning in this capacity, carried on a conversation which revealed that the patient was really on the verge of suicide, and because it was someone with whom he could communicate, it was picked up and it was dealt with by the Social Service Department of the hospital.

Now, I can't guarantee to you that there would not have been a professional person somewhere along the line who would have spotted this, but I think this is a fairly crucial thing. It means that a person who had been able to talk the language of the patient and to establish rapport with him had been given enough training in how to elicit information to get a very valuable piece of information, and there is a facility in that particular hospital to deal with it.

What we have done has been to insist that our trainees must not be placed in any part of the hospital where there is no on-going professional supervisory staff capable of responding to a need that the trainee finds.

For example, in the hospital where there is no professional personnel available for trainees when they are in need of consultation, and this has not worked out well.

Everywhere else, where the trainees have been placed, there has been a very carefully structured relationship between the on-going hospital staff and trainees and the functions that are quite carefully defined for the trainee of what they are expected to do, so that we really have a new dimension of service in this hospital.

In addition to that, the trainees are given instruction in how to go out into the community with health information. This is not some kind of an institutional barrier. This is a real need in a low-income community where people just do not understand a great deal about what they ought to be doing in nutrition and other problems.

We haven't gotten far enough into it for me to be able to tell you, yes, we know this is succeeding, but we know that the trainees are absorbing quite well the kind of instruction that is being given and that they have begun to function in disseminating the kind of information and bringing people back to the clinic who need to come back.

It is the linkage service that everybody talks about, using the poor as linkage to the poor. It is sometimes greatly glamorized, but in this particular instance, a linkage service is being established and it is a function nobody has been able to carry out very effectively.

So, we think we have something where the trainees have a clear enough definition of what they are supposed to do and where the community needs a service and, therefore, it is not just watering down what somebody else ought to be doing.

S. JACOBSON: I think that I can support what she said on the basis of our very limited experience, and not only has there been perhaps an increase or improvement in the distribution of service, perhaps also an enrichment of service.

Our particular community has a dearth of resources, by and large, and an excess of all kinds of psycho-social pathology. Our neighborhood service centers, which are small storefront centers out in the community and which tend to serve pretty much a five block radius of some fifty-thousand people, have managed to reach people who would just not know where and how to go to provide themselves with certain kinds of services. The workers in the center have dealt with a multipilcity of problems in providing a more effective link to services. These involve housing and welfare and consumer education and employment issues and family problems and health services, and they have done this in a variety of ways. It has been done in terms of expediting, as advocates, by providing education, by organizing people in the community so that they can begin to extend the idea of the so-called "helper principle" in organizing tenants in housing units, in informing them of how to handle their own housing problems.

They begin to set up organizations and they no longer need to turn to the workers in the center, except occasionally as consultants, and they begin to extend this so that we now have — at last count — some twenty-seven buildings that had organized tenants councils.

Barriers

R. LEEDS: The Social Service Employees Union has never objected to the utilization of case aides in the Department of Welfare. We have had a proposal for this.

However, the reaction to our proposal by the City has been that the creation of new positions is a managerial prerogative and it is not the union's job to really worry itself about what type of new jobs are created. Based on this, of course, the only assumption that we can make is that the new jobs threaten our jobs. We must assume the City is going to create low paying jobs in order to eliminate higher paying jobs, so that our experience has been even though we are willing to talk about the creation of newly paid jobs, we are expected to accept the jobs as a fait accompli which, of course, we will never do.

This only creates problems. If there is going to be some communication, the communication has to come from both sides.

R. LEFFERTS: There is another kind of barrier that, I think, we haven't talked about yet. We have recently been involved in interviewing about five-hundred major public and voluntary agencies who would be employers of the unemployed poor and one of the questions raised was the question of resistances.

I think a major resistance — and I don't know how you overcome it — is the attitude of employers towards the target population that we are talking about. The majority of employers seem to hold the opinion that the poor are poor because there is something wrong with them, that they are incapable of performing their tasks, that they will only be dead weight on the payroll — so to speak.

That attitude, coupled with the attitude of the so-called enlightened employers, who go to the other extreme and say it is not the fault of the poor. It is the system. These employers get all caught up in all of the remedial services and counseling and everything that the poor are going to need before they can perform on the job, which, for my reasoning, is really the same attitude as the guys who say the poor are no good.

Those two sets of attitudes on the part of employers, I think, represent perhaps the major resistances that will need to be overcome, if we are talking about a large scale program. Sure, you can always find X or Y or Z guy who thinks the way we do and sometimes we go "gung ho" with him and then we have a demonstration. But, we are talking about a large scale program here, and I think we have to face up to some of these realities of how most people in this country are thinking.

A. VOGEL: Taking the comment from this survey of employers, that employers have no faith in the poor and that they say if they are going to be able to do a job, there is so much counseling in the remediation, how are we are going to do it? I think this is a genuine problem. We know in the training that we have done, that it is perfectly possible to take a person with a lot of problems and limited education and limited experience and bring him to a point of becoming really productive and eventually getting him to the point where he is able to function quite well on his own. But there is an extensive period of training and extensive period of need for supportive services by a social worker or some other person who can work with that trainee around the complexity of poverty problems.

It would seem to me if the government is talking about where it invests its money, that this is the place that government has to invest in order to produce results at a future time. You can't necessarily expect that the employer will provide all the remediation and all the supportive services that will build strength in the individual. That strength **can** be built in. Isn't this really the sense of on-the-job training provisions of the Manpower Development and Training Act of investing in the training of people? If we can say that the government is ready to invest its funds in bringing people up to a level of self-sufficiency and employability, and we can demonstrate, as we believe we have in a number of programs, that once this is done, there is a substantial percentage of presently impoverished people on welfare or unemployment insurance or what have you, who then become fairly permanently self-supporting. This is a good investment of money. I think this is what we've got to sell.

W. DENHAM: I would want to comment on some of our experiences with job development. I would just make the bald statement that after two-and-a-half years, if you asked me how I would sum up the organization in response to job development for human service aides, I would say that virtually all the agencies I have come in contact with respond to the question in terms of the organizational need, rather than in terms of need for career development for nonprofessionals, and this shouldn't surprise us too much.

Let me give you a concrete example of this. We trained forty-seven teacher aides who were supposed to operate as sort of classroom technicians in jobs whose content was divided between instructional activity and non-instructional activity. It was weighted so that the non-instructional content was, about two-thirds and the instructional content, which is the more professional content, was one-third, to make this more palatable to the teaching profession.

We went ahead and tried to align a training program accordingly. They were to be placed in jobs at the GS-2 level. They were also to be placed in work settings for which they had been trained, because the rationale being the very obvious one that their adjustment as employees would be immeasurably more simplified if there was a continuity of relationship with the training supervisor and the work training supervisor.

Then there was the summer break. They came back and we found that these forty-seven aides had been scattered all over the school system. Some of them were being treated essentially as system maintenance operators. They were assigned to the office of the principal one day—basically assigned to the office of the principal who would parcel them out to handle a variety of tasks, some working with the teachers, some working in the office doing clerical work, some doing odd things.

Then a very interesting political event occurred. Some of you know that Washington is more or less a colony of the Federal Government. All our educational policy for the school system is set by Congress, and a new law has just been enacted and signed by Mr. Johnson which has established a new, if you will, nonprofessional position at what we call the GS-4 level. This calls for the high school diploma plus sixty hours of college training.

Then we found, for example, the law was so written that it tied the schools' hands in being able to employ any other auxiliary personnel in the system. We have since learned that the DC Civil Service, the Personnel Office of the District Government and the school have agreed now to a GS-2 position, which is, interestingly enough, not titled teacher aide at all, but is called school assistant. The job, as defined, is heavily oriented in the direction of what we would call secondary, nonteaching tasks.

The auxiliary personnel, therefore, are still outside the mainstream of the municipal budget. They are also really not seen as classroom operatives, but more as servants of the system.

I cite this experience to illustrate that I think the response here has been primarily in terms of what is the pay off for the system, not in terms of what is in the interest of the career development or the advancement of nonprofessionals.

F. SCHENCK: One of the things that we found in New Jersey in first trying to develop our project was that it was extremely important to bring Civil Service and all of the personnel people that would listen to us in as partners in the development of the program. It meant that we at least, at the outset, had some commitment and that they had some interest in what we were trying to do.

One of the things that was most appealing to the line personnel officers, for example, was the fact that they had a large number of vacant positions they were not able to fill, and they readily admitted that they didn't know too many poor people and they had not had the ability to tap this vital resource.

By bringing them in as partners in this operation, it facilitated our job development problems, because we were working from within the system and with the help of the professionals in the system, identifying their critical areas of need.

Thus we were able to talk to them about some of the new careers concept, but first we were appealing to their bread-and-butter problems of vacant positions and where they could get people, and with the assistance of training, utilize these people in a very vital role.

G. BOWMAN: I thought it might be of interest that in the fifteen projects that we have been coordinating, the most frequent complaint that we hear by both the professionals and the nonprofessionals, both the teachers and the aides, is that there is not enough time built into the program for evaluation and planning by teachers and aides together, when the children aren't there. This is one element that is going to be very difficult to institutionalize, because it is expensive.

One should not ask the teachers to stay overtime or come early to do this. One should not have the children given seat work while the teacher and the aide plan. So, this is a real problem. When there was time built in for review of their common experience by the team, that had just operated in the classroom, and joint planning to improve their cooperation the next day, the results were most enthusiastically greeted. Where there was joint planning, teachers who had not asked for aides, when first asked, would come up afterwards and say that we would like to have aides, but it is an area that requires a great deal of money and planning and cooperation.

Other Considerations

A. TREBACH: I think we must have a sense of history about what we are doing. If we look at this historically, you have to ask yourself where are we in the development of this so-called nonprofessional or sub-professional movement?

Clearly we are past the point of worrying about techniques, not that we shouldn't worry about techniques, but all of us deal with them. I think we are also past the point of saying how do you launch an experimental program, although we are launching experimental programs.

We are really at the point where we are saying how do we hope to get this whole thing into the structure of various communities? How do we get nonprofessionals on regular budget lines? We have said this a number of times.

You can take New York, you can take any city and right now you find that the mayors are saying we don't have the dollars for what we want right now. We are convinced we need it but we can't afford it. Therefore, you are into politics.

We might face the fact that we are now at a point where we must face political considerations of how we convince those people who control the money to make a decision not to do something else but to do this. They can't do everything they want.

I think we've got to start thinking in terms of how you accomplish this. Let me suggest a couple of ways. In order to effect the power structure, you don't always have to go to the top. Clearly people in the Civil Service system control power. I think this is one of the best places to start, which is to get the Civil Service people to recommend these lines.

Ultimately one of the best ways of getting this done is to view this in terms of affecting political decisions, in the best sense. I am not talking about backroom politics. I think we have to face the people in the budget offices of cities and we've got to get mayors, if necessary.

All this talk about techniques and whether or not you relate to a professional this way os that way doesn't mean a hill of beans, in some respects, because in two years you are going to have reports on this program, just like those you are getting on the Job Corps, where you spent $17,000 to train one nonprofessional and the net result is twenty-two jobs in the city and no one wants to pay for it. What good has the whole thing done?

I think we have to convince people we are not little old ladies in tennis shoes.

S. LESH: I would also like to know how transferable the skills that we are teaching are to other areas, including private industry? Can people move from these entry jobs in the service areas into private industry with what we have provided for or would they be just in these service areas? Does anybody have information on these lines? Are there any studies?

B. HILL: I don't have any information on it, but I have an idea. I have an idea that it is really not enough to train a poor person in a skill, a specific kind of skill. He has to be trained in general areas. He has to be able to transfer, at whatever level he is functioning to another level, quite in the same way that any one of us is able to transfer from one job to another one, because we've got some basic skills that are peculiar, let's say, to counseling, to social work and so forth. This is the kind of thing we have to do in addition to specific skill training to effect the kind of mobility that is necessary.

H. KRANZ: It seems to me that there are two different viewpoints being expressed, and at times they get a little confused, about what we are talking about in the nonprofessional or subprofessional or professional aide area.

I get the impression that some people are talking about jobs that now exist in public agencies and in private nonprofit agencies, and there is a line item budget and all you have to do is put sixteen aides instead of four professionals. Is it just a matter of budget switching or convincing Civil Service just to change job titles and exchange some money, or is the problem one of are the aides going to be able to perform the public service that a professional performs? This is talking largely about existing jobs, like nurses aides that we have known about for a long time.

Then, on the other hand, I get another strain which is looking ahead to a program in a vast new bill that has just been passed, even though it is going to start modestly, aimed at hundreds of thousands of new opportunities. I don't want to get involved again in the career controversy, but in new fields, where I think there can be a lot of selling to agencies that now would answer a questionnaire favorably. There hasn't been enough, if you will, job development done on this need.

Now, some of us have had experience, and that is why we view favorably creating new jobs that never were done before, jobs that are not taking anything away, that are providing new services to the public.

It seems to me that the task of job development and of meeting the budget problem is to look at the fact that we have a new ball game here. This legislation has gone through so quietly most of us don't even know how significant this piece of legislation is going to be, but this will give us an opportunity to develop new jobs, to not compete, I hope, with existing jobs. The major tool is going to be the carrot of federal money, not city and state funds, but new federal money to prime the pump to create these new jobs and new services, to bring the people in to fill them.

I think if those of us who have had one kind of experience will bear with the people who have had the other kind of experience, we wouldn't be arguing about two sets of facts.

D. FOX: I just wanted to raise a few concerns that I felt in this last phase of the discussion. One is a sense that despite all the criticism of traditional agencies that has been aired today, that many of us tend to slide into the position of doing things for the poor, a kind of protectiveness.

Our job as professionals is to negotiate with that other pro over there as one pro to another on behalf of creating a job or a career ladder.

We are working for our clients to get them into the system.

My own feeling is that most of us probably have had experience that there is very little chance of a learning situation for another professional when confronted with us as professionals, and I raise some serious tactical questions of how you get around this.

Now the standard response to this problem is do some demonstration projects and then you go as a professional to your colleagues — benighted as he may be — and say, "Open your eyes, baby, and book," but again my experience is that most of my colleagues will say, "Yeah, that's a nice demonstration, but all it proves it the other guy's problem is the guy in whose institution the demo took place, is different from mine."

I think we need some alternative based on what we know about learning. Let me just throw out briefly an alternative line which, in fact, started two months ago in Massachusetts in ten communities — and it is probably going to fail — but we are putting a lot of staff time into the process of failure. We feel that so much of our time and sensitivity goes into building up our own frustrations, as we knock our heads against other guys' walls. Why can't we lend those sensitivities to the poor in the same way that a good clinician or a good counselor lends his guts to his clients?

What we are trying to do here is to mobilize resources and to give people skills in two areas. One, the technical area of remedial education and the other the area of how an American organizes his way into the job market, public and private. Part of the stated job this year, that we are paying a semi-inadequate wage for, is to organize yourself into the system. We will stand by to help you out as best we can, but you are the live animal that is going into the market, and that fellow over there, no matter what he wants to call you, is either going to buy because he needs you or not buy. If he doesn't buy it, then you failed, we failed.

III. POLICY AND ADMINISTRATIVE EXPERIENCE — PROBLEMS AND ISSUES

Remarks of Mr. George P. Hodges:
"The Federal Civil Service"

The basic reason for Civil Service was to get the spoils system and political patronage out of government employment. It was with this in mind that these laws were written with a general, very basic requirement that when positions were to be filled they would be filled through open competitive examination.

This means publicity so that all the citizens may know about openings and competition with some type of a testing or examining mechanism that is fair, reasonable and practical. This is to insure that the job goes to the person with highest rank on the list, resulting from the best score on a given examination. This is common to all Civil Service operations.

In more recent years, Civil Service Commissions, at least some of them, have felt a greater responsibility to serve as personnel managers for their jurisdictions. We have come to look upon our role not simply as an anti-spoils operation, but as the personnel office of the United States Government. Depending upon how the Commission looks at it, flexibility or rigidity can be built into these operations. Yet, there is a lot of flexibility in the law.

We have felt the need for some time to provide some kind of a career opportunity for disadvantaged youth. The federal agencies cooperate with the Neighborhood Youth Corps. We have many NYC enrollees working for us. We have the Youth Opportunity Program every summer, where we employ disadvantaged youth for summer jobs.

It has been extremely difficult to get disadvantaged people into slots where they can start up a career ladder with job permanence. There are practical reasons for this. Most of them cannot pass a written examination, which is required for most entry jobs in the Civil Service. An attempt to meet this problem is an innovation developed in the greater New York City regional office of the U.S. Civil Service for an opening as Youth Opportunity Trainee. This offers appointments to the federal civil service for a number of disadvantaged youth. Applicants here would not be selected on the basis of written tests, nor would education and experience be used as requirements. The positions provide for on-the-job training as aides in a variety of white and blue collar functions in the federal service, and the entry salaries would be pegged at $69.50 to $79.50 per week, with opportunity to advance to higher levels of responsibility based on qualifications and job performance.

This illustrates one example of what we are trying to do, and how we are operating with a measure of flexibility.

This approach was introduced just last week for which planning began last spring.

Now, admittedly this innovation is not precisely along the lines of the Scheuer Bill. However, I think we see how it relates to it.

As was noted earlier, competition has to be open and opportunities must be publicized. Now disadvantaged kids are often the very ones who don't read the newspapers or don't know where the high school guidance counselor's office is located, so our regular channels of publicity do not always get to them. Rather, the announcements of examinations more often reach those that are less disadvantaged who take the examination and get good marks, while the ones that we are looking for are cut out.

In New York City, as in most of the larger cities of the country, there is an organization called the Federal Executive Board. It is sponsored by the President, and is made up of the heads of the major federal establishments in the area. The current Chairman of the New York Federal Executive Board is Oscar Backie, the Regional Director of the FAA. Others serving are the Regional Commissioner of Internal Revenue, the managers of the VA hospitals and so on.

These men meet, talk, and put programs into effect that have nothing to do with their own particular operations. For example, I am on a subcommittee right now to try and work out a system for getting federal employees to work the next time a subway strike occurs. These are some of the things we do.

At any rate, the Federal Executive Board saw the need for some medium for getting young disadvantaged people into government service. Accordingly, they committed themselves to a search for suitable jobs. We had to sit and meet with the personnel officers for individual agencies who reluctantly went along. The Federal Personnel Association also agreed to cooperate.

Our next problem then was to work up concrete plans for job redesign, something we have been doing for many years. And it is here where the really difficult problems have been encountered. Since last June a sustained effort has been underway, involving a number of approaches to federal agencies, sitting down with the operating official or the line supervisor and seeking to gain their cooperation on mapping out specific job redesigns for their agencies. So, people from our office have actually been going out to agencies, trying to find where jobs could be redesigned and then getting a commitment from agency management on providing a specific number of openings in a given job.

Just a few examples of what we have achieved in the way of basic entry jobs.

1. In Long Island City at the Army Pictorial Center, a film studio where the Army's training films are made, we have won a commitment from them to hire a certain number of persons for a job that will lead to a stagehand-journeyman occupation. Skilled stagehands are workers who erect stage scenery, are responsible for lighting, etc. The stagehand union is very strong, but we've won their cooperation in developing an apprenticeship for this job.

2. Up near West Point, there sits a mothball fleet of liberty ships under the Maritime Administration. They are kept in condition by a group of men in an occupation called fleet workman, which is a combination painter, carpenter, welder, sandblaster, and any collateral trade needed to keep a ship in order while it is in mothballs. It is a skilled trade but we have gained a commitment for ten or more jobs there as trainee fleet workman which provide for salaries of $70 to $80 a week to start, but will culminate in a full journeyman level salary.

3. We have commitments from the veterans hospitals to start people off as junior nursing assistants that eventually lead to a nursing assistant, which means that with time they may become practical nurses with some technical responsibilities in jobs in hospitals.

4. A number of agencies have agreed to take people on as trainee keypunch operators. This means they have to teach them typing as a prerequisite to learning keypunching. There may be a lot of falling by the wayside, but they are willing to do it. These represent a few of the programs we've undertaken.

Earlier, we alluded to the basic stumbling blocks that the Civil Service throws up against things like this.

1. **Publicity.** One of them is publicity. We must circulate this information regarding openings in the press, on the radio and it has to be posted in employment service offices, post offices, etc. But what we want to do is to get these announcements to disadvantaged youth.

2. **Written Examinations.** I mentioned the examining technique that must be used to rate applicants who have to score between seventy and one hundred. So how do we do this, i.e., getting disadvantaged people to score up in this range? This is a major stumbling block with Civil Service.

3. **Pressure.** Another thing I think you ought to recognize is that Civil Service Commissions are under pressures. There are organizations such as the Civil Service League, which are always looking over the shoulder of the Commission and will resist, with considerable pressure and power, any attempt to change or circumvent the law.

4. **Union Resistance.** Employee unions are also very strong. President Eisenhower once got irked at the National Association of Letter Carriers. He said they had the most powerful lobby in Congress, and he was probably right. But these associations are very strong and they will not stand for any change that threatens to modify the traditional system with which they themselves are accustomed.

5. **Professional Resistance.** When one is dealing with Commissions and asking them to change or modify things, one has to realize the pressures they are under. Of course, they are under similar kinds of pressures from professional societies, too. You don't write a qualification standard for a professional job without consulting the society. You don't have to do what the society says, but you sure better consult with them. Otherwise you are in deep trouble.

Finally, in dealing with agencies or various governmental organizations, one is liable to be told that something can't be done because Civil Service won't allow it. Well, there are almost as many crimes committed in the name of Civil Service as the Bible. If one gets an answer like this from a governmental agency, check it out with the Civil Service Commission. It is so easy for individual agencies to use the Civil Service to avoid something that they really don't want themselves.

Remarks of Mr. J. Douglas Grant:
"State Level — Policy and Administrative Experience."

I'd like to talk about systems — changing systems, and to very much emphasize that this is the main game, as I see it, and as Congressman Scheuer brought out yesterday. We don't have enough money to materially affect the problems of society with the existing commitments, and our game is to try to find out things, try to develop things that will put us in a better position to be more effective for the time when society **is** ready to take some major steps that we anticipate need to be taken and will be taken.

1. **Agency Change and Nonprofessionals.** I'd like to talk briefly about how I got into this business. I think I represent your target group when we talk about how to bring about change in public agencies. I am a certified professional whose business it is to work with public agency policy decisions, and I came into this field that way. I didn't come in at all wanting to do good for the poor, but rather to try to make an agency, a public agency, more effective.

The agency in this case was Corrections, and someone about fifteen years ago named Cressey said that if you want to rehabilitate offender A, try to get him to rehabilitate offender B. Nobody paid very much attention to that then but it is getting a lot of attention now. It seems to make an awful lot of sense in the things being done by Alcoholics Anonymous units and more directly back into the correctional field, the things that are going on in the Synanon type program.

There are now 255 self-help movements throughout this country, where even some fairly hard data and certainly from the kinds of impressions one gets, it seems very plausible that things happen with nonprofessionals in these programs — in terms of effecting the kind of behavior that agencies are aiming at — that don't happen when professionals try to treat the clients.

So, to find ways of building change agents into agency structure is how I got into this—and with a grant from the National Institute of Mental Health. We ran a conference on the use of the product of a social problem for coping with problems — such as rackets, crime, delinquency, etc. and even then we were talking about the more general applications of this kind of approach.

There were people like Richard Boone in on the conference, and this got us closer and closer to what is now the kind of thrust from the Office of Economic Opportunity. My point is that, aside from trying to do something for the poor, there is a considerable body of knowledge, as well as a tremendous mandate, for agency change. I think if you try to avoid this, you are only complicating your problem. You've got an ally here to work with.

Now, we have been thinking that the concept of agency change needs to be linked with in-service training much more directly. One can't just change without changing the staffs, too, and then more directly, one can't change agencies without changing clients.

2. **Client Change.** In my own field—but I think it is proving equally true in many other fields—the inmates run our institutions and you aren't going to change them much unless those inmates get with you. It is probably true also that we aren't going to change social welfare as much as we think, unless the recipients get with us. So, we've got to start looking for models that merge program change, in-service training and client or new careers development, in terms of the concept here as I see it.

I see an excellent opportunity now for us to review some hard experience in expanding this approach to agency change. I would be very disappointed if our efforts at using this help that we so desperately need were dissipated on a model that did not encompass the forces for change in programming or for bringing about changes in staff, but instead concentrated all this money on creating deadend jobs for a few clients, and keeping them out on the periphery where they won't get into the agency, won't disturb the staff and won't disturb the system.

That is only avoiding the issue that eventually has to be faced. This program will be added to the countless ones we already have, where people are treated simply as clients.

3. **The California Experience.** Now, within that kind of setting, we have tried to work with the more general issue of participation, particularly in the California state system.

We started by surveying the possibilities of utilizing a "participant model" using persons who are not now regarded as profesional staff, and incorporating them into state agencies. We purposely brought the Personnel Board, which is the state equivalent of the Federal Civil Service Commission, in on this initial survey in addition to the Department of Finance. We kept in close touch with the labor unions.

It developed very clearly that these agencies, which are called control agencies, did not feel it was fair that they should be seen as the barriers to change, although the agency wanted them to be so seen. We got rather quickly to the point where it was conceded that the Civil Service system now protects professionalism because the agencies have been asking them to do for the past two decades. A number of rationales have been offered for it.

There is nothing embodied in the Civil Service regulations that requires one to have an AB or an MA degree or anything of the sort. In fact, we found, rather quickly, some very nice precedents in the Los Angeles Civil Service system. They had on record that having had a history of alcoholism is an asset on a job working with alcoholics. A plus credit is granted for this kind of experience.

Now, this concept has tremendous potential in working with other kinds of clients. Similarly with drugs, as far as Civil Service is concerned one could have positive experience with the use of drugs. Such people have unique assets in terms of their experience. In being able to evaluate that kind of experience, however, it may very well be that we don't have enough data, but it is quite possible that having a history of alcohol addiction may render one more effective in a program treating alcoholics than having completed medical school.

In last year's state budget, we had funds to fill two full-time positions on the Personnel Board. We filled one of the positions. However, the Director of the Personnel Board would not circulate to other agencies the notice we prepared that the position was filled until further clearance comes from the new administration.

We moved from setting up this, i.e., from some kind of formally recognized position on the Personnel Board, to setting up task forces which would work with any agencies, where we found a receptive climate most ready for us to move.

I think this can come two ways. One, I'd like to give priority to try to move where there is hard money now, and mandates for new kinds of programming and new kinds of staffing. These people are the most ready to share problems with you. In the State Department of Health, we have a task force set up, with two of our people. Here we are playing a role in establishing guidelines and standards for new programs in the field of alcoholism. The state expanded its own program with federal money in the field of mental retardation. They are moving ahead in the area of medical services with a hard look at this neighborhood health center idea.

I think the thing that comes up here is the merging of program planning and program development with the development of the new careerists. We have got an awful lot of hard homework to do, besides the public relations part of it and the public education. We need to think through, with the help of the agency staff, how we can get an appropriate or reasonable new service system that builds in new roles for the staff, as well as new roles for these people.

There are many people around this country who have these assignments.

They probably aren't going to think too much of the role of the new careerists, unless we get with them. I am quite sure from what we have found in California, and some of you have found in other places, you won't find nearly the resistance you might expect when they've got a real problem and they are looking for some help.

Let me just give a quick example of that. I recently went to a conference to set up a California State Manpower Council — Health Manpower Council — and they were sweating and squirming about where on earth were they going to get the manpower. They had somebody, an MD from the University of California who was talking in "university" terms about the feasibility of revising training. If you could create a position someplace maybe between a nurse and an MD, but he was quick to note only if we now knew just exactly what we wanted that person to be like, we'd really be talking about something from seven to ten years from now before those people would be coming out of these schools and into the available market to help us with our problems.

They were also talking very much about the health industry competing with the education business and so on.

The Department of Mental Hygiene out there has asked us to work formally with them in reviewing their psychiatric technician series, which is a series actually very close to a new careers-type model. It does, at present, require a high school diploma, but after that the state trains them. It trains some through subsidy for junior college work, but most through its own training program. They go through a training session to become a Psychtech one, Psychtech two, Psychtech three, and at least on paper, it is possible to become the Deputy Director of Mental Hygiene through the chain of promotions, and not only that, you are able to get to be a nurse on the way up.

They are trying to work out a class lower than the trainee, which eliminates the requirement for high school graduation, and then to build this into the series. What is more impressive to me is that they want to examine its duties, as well as its advancement possibilities. Here again you get a group that has a real problem and is quite willing, I think, to go through with this.

Changing Systems

I'd like to talk about this business of systems for changing systems. That's what we are all doing now, and there are a lot of people around this country trying to change programs. We need manpower in doing it, and certainly if we are at all on the right track, this thing is going to be increasing in terms of the demand for change. We are going to need a lot more staff in the area of program development and program change.

Almost five years ago we proposed training some new careerists to serve on teams as program development assistants. We argued that you would need assistance in developing programs and that we should use a person who had had experience in program development on these teams. They also included a couple of graduate students and some part-time people and some nonprofessionals on a full-time basis.

Well, we have trained eighteen serious criminal offenders in California to work with us in this business of trying to bring about program change. They have all been through four months of training while confined, and an additional four months of training while out in the community. Sixteen of the eighteen have been working now from eight months to twenty-four months in jobs which range in salary from $6,000 a year to, I believe, $12,000 a year. Their average income now being a little over $8,000 a year.

The sixteen are accumulating a fairly impressive record. One of them is working with a task force in public health in developing programs within the health field. One of them is employed by the Mental Hygiene State Hospital at Mendocino in the formal role of a program developer. He has developed a program with some help, but largely on his own, a program where the hospital is providing the resources for training eight alcoholics to be rural community organizers for the local CAP program. This involved detailed staff work and a considerable amount of conceptualizing. Vocational Rehabilitation is providing the money for the training for the patients, and the trainers are two of our program development assistants.

I don't want to be too dramatic about the achievements of these men. They do vary tremendously, but I think they make the case strong enough to give serious consideration to the use of nonprofessionals, particularly, many of the nonprofessionals that we have been developing for more formal roles. Besides putting them into training roles we should put them into program development roles. It is very possible to think of a class of Program Development Assistant, Program Development Associate, Program Development Senior as a new entity that we could very rightfully use in our own work.

We are also thinking in California of a Rehabilitation Assistant, Rehabilitation Associate, and Rehabilitation Senior. We do have the first as a Civil Service class, and we do have a Community Relations position that we have on the drawing board to work towards becoming an assistant, associate and senior, and we hope to have a Program Development Assistant, Associate and Senior.

A final word about this matter of how to develop systems for change. I am trying to do with our field what we need other people to do with their fields — health system program, with their correctional system program, with their welfare system program. We've got to change our way of trying to change others. Besides bringing in new staff into systems and working out ways of training them, we need to think of new innovations for getting with the existing system.

If some way to get the system to do this, systematically, we could start to meet the demands it has to meet within the next decade. I don't want to be glib about this. I am bringing it up as an example of the kind of thinking I think we need to have systems for bringing about changes in systems.

DISCUSSION
Civil Service Barriers

S. LESH: There is slowly emerging in the United States a recognition that private industry has been failing in its responsibility with respect to human resource training, particularly in entry occupations, and the U.S. Government, through the personnel arm of the Civil Service Commission, should be showing the way to private industry in the United States, specifically by going to the less qualified, those who need the most help in achieving employability, and taking on a training obligation.

MR. HODGES: Let me speak to that. You are by no means alone in feeling this way. But I think what I was trying to get across in my talk is that while we want to adopt a different approach, we are also a body bound by law, which gives very specific guides as to what we can and cannot do.

Unless the law is changed by the Congress, by the people of the United States, we can't do anything else. We have to run a Civil Service Commission. This is what the people of the United States want us to do. We can't change and hire from the bottom of the list instead of the top unless the law is changed. This is clear and simple and factual, and it is what we and every other Civil Service jurisdiction is bound to follow.

S. SADOFSKY: May I ask specifically from your point of view, and from your concern as an individual with the disadvantaged, what aspects of the existing Civil Service law should really be considered for change?

G. HODGES: I am not saying that I feel that the law should be changed. I said you are not alone in thinking this way, but if you are thinking along these lines, the written requirement is that of open competition and an examination process in which first positions go to those who rank highest. This language is written in some way into all Civil Service Acts, and we are required to follow this.

S. LESH: Does the answer to that problem lie in differentiating between an employee and a trainee? By using alternative criteria and standards for providing people with on the job training, the U.S. Government would then lead the way for private industry instead of lagging behind it.

G. HODGES: No. You know, there are all kinds of training programs in which we involve ourselves, such as the Neighborhood Youth Corps and our big summer Youth Opportunity Campaign, but trainees are not employees, and that is precisely the problem. What we would like is to hire people as regular career employees so that they may start up the ladder. But in order to do that, they have to come through the Civil Service examination system.

G. BOWMAN: I wonder if it would not be relevant, and a justifiable criterion in many jobs, to require that the applicant be a resident of a given low-income area, where the services are being performed. It is already required in some of the school programs that teacher aides be residents of the community served by the school.

Another illustration: In New York City, a rather creative idea for utilizing the nonprofessionals came from the Building Department, which used to send out two professionals to inspect a building where there were complaints of building code violations so that they could protect one another, since many were afraid to go alone into some of the buildings. They now have community people serving as security aides, and this has doubled their professional staff. Now, one professional person who goes to inspect the violations is accompanied by an indigenous security aide, and that aide has to know the community, so that residence therein seems a rather justifiable criterion.

G. HODGES: This might be, although one has to be careful about this. Actually, our trend has been to widen and even abolish residency requirements. I can cite you a reason for this. For example, for the clerks and carrier positions in the post office — one of the largest federal employers — it has always been the pattern that the first to be considered for a particular postal position are those who live in the delivery area of that post office. This is done for community relations, etc. That's a good thing. Your own mailman lives in your town.

But then we see some postmasters out in some very posh suburban towns — I won't mention them; all of you know where they are around New York City — where there are few or no Negro residents. Yet these same postmasters are continually screaming that they can't hire clerks or carriers very easily, perhaps because all of the boys in that town go to college to become lawyers. But they won't go outside to recruit in the neighboring big town where there are a lot of Negro applicants on the register.

We are breaking this tendency down so that the postmaster has to go to the big list. In this way we are doing a better job on equal employment opportunities, so that your suggestion on residency might be productive in some instances but in other instances it might just have the opposite effect.

G. BOWMAN: But it would depend upon the purpose of the program. While a residential requirement would be very bad in some instances, it might be helpful in others.

R. LEFFERTS: On this point of getting credit for being residents in the neighborhood, there are examples: Detroit, where the employees of the community action agency are all city employees, get a certain number of points for being residents of the area. It took some effort to get the Detroit Civil Service agency to come around to that point of view, but it was done.

I wanted to get back to the trainee strategy that Mr. Hodges sort of discarded quickly when the question was first raised. As I understand your rationale, you say that this is not appropriate as a strategy for Civil Service because of its primary function of qualifying and ranking candidates for employment.

I know that there are communities that are using or have plans to use the trainee approach by creating thousands of trainee jobs in city agencies and that, while these people are employees of the city on a provisional basis, the agencies do not require any qualifying examination or educational requirements. The understanding is that after one year as a trainee, the individual may then go through the qualifying process. But during that first year period — and these are not OJT programs — the person is an employee of the city.

Now, I would be interested in your reaction to this kind of strategy for moving people into employment in the trainee classifications.

G. HODGES: Well, the initial stumbling block is still the qualification procedures. We have considered rather seriously something like that of bringing people into the Service as trainees or beginners or whatever you want to call them. But they still would not have Civil Service status. It would be analogous to the temporary and provisional categories in Civil Service, where a year or so of successful performance could be used in lieu of an examination. Now that he has proved himself, he becomes a part of the career Civil Service.

This approach has been very seriously considered. The understanding so far is that it is illegal, and this has been the decision at the highest levels of the U.S. Civil Service Commission in Washington. We have submitted such plans along these lines in the past and have found them to be illegal.

A. VOGEL: I would just like to point out one booby trap in this notion of recruiting residents to guarantee getting low income people. There may be areas in New York where it would work, but in our area we have found very serious problems in dealing with residents whose incomes were middle income level. New York City is one of those communities where there is a great mixture of high, middle and low income in most sections, so that unless there is an income plus resident requirement for the area, there would be no guarantee that you are reaching the low income people.

C. CARR: I would just like to comment on that. I think it would be very bad in most instances, because I think that we are looking to get kids out and into the system and certainly the system, except in the case where we might build a state office building in Harlem, is not going to have much impact on the residents in the community.

Moreover, I am a little disturbed about the idea of taking kids from the bottom of the ladder. I do want them from there, but I don't think we should label them as such. There are many, many kids at the bottom of the ladder motivationally who, in fact, are pretty sharp kids, and I think we want to get them into a program like this. I think that we should so gear the testing procedures somehow so that we will be able to identify real quality in the boys who might be coming to this job.

G. HODGES: Well, I agree with you, and that is very tough. Applicants may be high quality, but with low motivation.

E. CLARK: This is related to something that has already been touched upon, and it is requirements or the criteria set up for rating. It seems to me that the criteria have been established here for your Youth Opportunity Trainee are the kinds which will screen out the very kids for whom this program is designed to accept. I don't see how you will determine job aptitude without giving them tests or examinations. And if we are speaking of the disadvantaged youth, for example, and we want information regarding his aptitude or work experience and its quality, we probably won't find any.

On the questioon of their interest, none may be indicated, because they have had little reason for hope. Ability to follow directions? Generally I think you will find that if they have had any kind of work history, it is going to be poor in this area too. Also, if you use the school record, I think we may not be able to get adequate information from the school, because many of the disadvantaged youths do not follow directions in school.

Ability to work as a member of a team? I don't think that there is going to be enough background here either. Reliability and dependability are yet another hard assessment, and very often the disadvantaged are characterized as not being reliable or dependable. No, I am not quite sure how you are going to go about the selection.

G. HODGES: Your views are well founded, but remember, first of all, we were trying to gear this so that it would be largely the disadvantaged who would file. Also we have been asking the referral agencies to help these kids file.

Second, while yes, we want the disadvantaged, you know, we might get twenty-thousand applications, and I don't think we are going to have more than five-hundred jobs. We want the best of the disadvantaged, if we can get them.

Civil Service and Upward Mobility

C. CARR: Even for the best of the disadvantaged, there seems to be something lacking, or perhaps taken for granted, in this program, and that is the provision for upward mobility. I think that any program which relies upon the agency to provide the on-the-job training is building into it a deadend kind of situation.

A logical attempt in this program would have been to affiliate it with, say, city universities or new urban skill centers which are being established specifically to provide this kind of training, so that a person getting into the system, receiving both the occupational training and remediation and other things to upgrade him or to have him certified under the supervision of the university, this would then give him the first passport to upward mobility. He could then proceed to the associate degree program and, hopefully, other advanced training within a continuum of an organized educational program.

Simply to take these people and to throw them into an agency and leave it to the agency to develop on-the-job training and then after a probationary year — if they work out — they get the job for as long as they want, doesn't seem to be the kind of program which takes advantage of all the other resources that are available to enable the person to go up the ladder.

R. KANE: It is interesting that Mr. Hodges has not mentioned the aides publication just released by the U.S. Civil Service after a year's study by a special task force. This program does provide for upward mobility, has added a new lower position, and provides for a series from GS-2 to GS-9. At some point along the line, high school equivalency becomes a factor and it also provides for grade raises on the basis of experience and demonstrated skill, but has an entry position that did not exist in the past which will permit people to enter without experience into a trainee position.

We felt this was the first big effort of any Civil Service to attempt to set up a graded ladder. It seems there are certain similarities between your program and that one, but the latter does have trainee positions, most of them for six months at an entry level of GS-2 or GS-3. Virtually none of them requires a high school education until the second or third level in the ladder has been reached.

G. HODGES: I'd like to say something about that, not about the new program, because I am not too familiar with it. But from some conversations that I have had around here, I'd like to say what our position is on educational requirements. The U.S. Civil Service Commission does not have educational requirements in its examinations, except for a certain limited number of specific professional positions, in which a person has to pass the professional standards in order to practice, such as law, medicine and dentistry and scientific research positions.

In other words, if we hire a research chemist, we can insist on a Bachelor's Degree. But if it is not research, he need not have gone even to high school. Under no conditions do we impose a requirement for a high school education as, I believe, many state and city Civil Services do.

This wasn't our doing. The Congress wrote our law this way about twenty years ago. We thought it was horrible at the time, but now we think it is fine. We have learned to live with it, and it enables us to hire good engineers who never went to college.

As far as I know, I'm not aware of any state or city Civil Service Act that spells out educational requirements. These education requirements generally are written into standards by the standards writers, and are just old practice. I imagine — and I am guessing about this — that where you do run across stumbling blocks, stipulating requirements for a high school education or two years of college or even a college education — that with a little imagination and the right kind of pressure, local Civil Service Commissions could write them out. We don't have them as requirements at all.

Changing Civil Service

J. FISHMAN: It just occurs to me that since the problems of Civil Service are both so crucial and so complicated, particularly around those issues having to do with qualifications and exams, and since most of our experience in the Washington area has to do with winning exceptions to the rule, that rather than having the Civil Service system revised, what we are really talking about leads us, I think, to the necessity of trying to formulate federal legislation to revise some of the Civil Service rules and regulations.

In the long run, probably this is the most crucial thing that we could do, if somehow somebody could formulate some guidelines and have them introduced, this would be a big payoff.

S. SADOFSKY: I think so. I would just add that there would also seem to be in the development of these programs by the Federal Civil Service Commission the necessity to reach out into the community for purposes of program development. There needs to be closer relationships between all levels of Civil Service and the professionals and nonprofessionals in the community in these public service agencies, not solely for the purpose of recruitment and selection and so on, but also from the point of view of original program development.

Perhaps with the experience of a more intensive relationship along these lines, suggestions for new legislation, for identifying obstacles and for determining whether or not they can, in fact, be overcome simply by legislation might develop.

J. FISHMAN: Let me back that up. What I was suggesting is not merely the kind of legislation that would aim to eliminate barriers, but laws which would somehow push the Civil Service to actively explore and create new kinds of job possibilities and new kinds of job mobility lines so that the guidelines and the qualifications are conducive to New Careers. In short, there should be an active, aggressive attempt in Civil Service to develop new career lines and new job descriptions, rather than just minimizing or reducing barriers.

G. HODGES: We are doing this. This is an active program. When I pointed out this Youth Opportunity program, it was just one example. There are many things going on. Of course, you remember Mr. Logue's number one problem was money, and it's ours, too.

S. SADOFSKY: How would a local community, for example, organize to deliver the right kind of pressure to the right agency within the Federal Civil Service Commission? Who would they see?

G. HODGES: I am right here. A lot of people go right to John Macy, the Chairman of the Commission, and this sometimes has effect. He is getting to be a pretty busy man.

On a local basis, there are ten regional offices of the U.S. Civil Service Commission in principal cities — Boston, New York, Philadelphia, Chicago, San Francisco and so on. They are the first point of contact for any local agency, and on a national basis, I thing national contact should be made with the headquarters of the Commission in Washington.

I'd like to mention one thing regarding pressure. If there is going to be pressure on federal people, you might as well let them know about it. Remember I mentioned the Federal Executive Board? This was started by President Kennedy and President Johnson has seized on it with delight. As I explained, it is an organization of top federal managers in any city. Some of them are called Federal Executive Associations. I don't know how many there are. The principal one is here in New York City. Others include Buffalo, Syracuse, Albany, Northern New Jersey and Southern New Jersey, Newark and Trenton.

They meet regularly on a varying basis. They are used by the administration to carry out administration policies, a good deal of which involves such things as equal employment and opportunities for the disadvantaged. The President's Youth Opportunity Campaign, which has now run for two summers, is guided at the top through these organizations. The Internal Revenue man, the hospital man and the FAA man sit down and formulate plans for equal opportunity and personnel and so on.

These are good points of contact for community programs. In many cases, they themselves are going out and contacting community groups to work with them.

E. LYNTON: I feel I must rise to the defense of Civil Service. Mr. Hodges' earlier point that agencies shift the blame for their irrelevant or archaic restrictions is very well taken. I think it is rather preposterous for us to expect Civil Service to initiate the changes in job design. They are, after all, an agency to implement the wishes of agencies. In evaluating CAP programs, there are some whose employees are under Civil Service jurisdiction. They report they had no difficulty in negotiating with Civil Service when they knew what they wanted. Comparing programs with and without Civil Service standing, we found no substantial differences in job descriptions.

F. SCHENCK: In response to Dr. Fishman's urging that some changes take place in the Civil Service law, I think one of the most exciting things to come down the pike recently is a bill originally drafted by Senator Muskie and now being distributed in a slightly different form by Chairman Macy of the U.S. Civil Service Commission which will provide grants to state and local personnel agencies for them to do the kind of planning to effect system changes that we have been talking about.

I certainly think it deserves the support of everybody here to get that kind of new system money into operation.

G. HODGES: You are very right and it is exciting and unless it has since been written out, there is something in the bill that will give to the U.S. Civil Service Commission a kind of an inspection operation over state Civil Service Commissions.

F. SCHENCK: I am not happy about that part.

G. HODGES: I mentioned that some of them are more hidebound and we'd like to get our fingers in there and try to loosen them up a little bit.

Strategies for Institutional Change

Change Through Client Involvement

P. MORGAN: I'd like to address a question to Mr. Grant. You said that agency changes must be linked to both in-service training and changing clients. It appears to me that most agencies have a rather established clientele, and I wonder if you would elaborate on your remarks about changing the clients.

J. D. GRANT: Yes. I think a good example of this is in the corrections field. There is a joint commission now, and Representative Edith Green of Oregon introduced a bill last year setting up a study on correctional manpower and training needs.

Now, the commission's original pitch was very much the same as the Health Manpower Council. It was thinking entirely in terms of increasing university training, increasing training incentives to enhance its attractiveness, such as higher salaries as an inducement for others to come in, and so on.

However, largely with the support of Vocational Rehabilitation there has been a shift towards interest in the use of nonprofessionals. A conference supported by NIMH, we pulled together a group of people, including offenders who are now working in correctional fields. We tried not just to further document the case that offenders can be a manpower resource, but also to raise the kinds of issues that have to be thought through to make such a program successful. We need a lot more of that kind of thinking.

I feel that the client in any system can become very much part of the program. As they become part of the program, it becomes conducive to effective service and rather dramatic things start to happen. As long as we continue to treat the client as someone outside the system, even though we may have tremendous resources, not very much happens.

I don't know how well acquainted you are with the corrections field, but the fact that 16 of these 18 people mentioned before have now, for many months, been operating effectively in the community is a tremendous potential breakthrough here in terms of service.

P. MORGAN: In effect, you are saying, then, involve the client in program planning, rather than try to change the clientele.

J. D. GRANT: Right, and this results in change in both clientele and staff. Fred Schenck raised the question of how to arrange supervisory training for supervision and training for professional staff. The model that interests me is one that brings the staff and the clients, including the nonprofessionals together to plan and develop new programs and then backing them up with resources.

S. SADOFSKY: When you refer to change as a result of client involvement, do you refer to change in the sense of an improvement in existing services? In short, the client participation permits a better similar service. Or are you talking of change in terms of new directions, perhaps new ways of doing things or, are you talking of both?

J. D. GRANT: I am very much talking about both. The basic premise is that we know everything has to change. I think the participation model is a very good lead to follow in terms of ways in which agencies can move. There should be other leads. What we need are systems of agency service that are not static.

In my mind, the concept of the manual program as the way to do it, in employment service, corrections, mental hygiene, etc. is completely obsolete social welfare. There shouldn't be any more programs as such. There should only be innovations, demonstrations, etc. And everybody ought to be concerned about better ways of doing things.

L. LEVINE: I am very much disturbed that the approach here to career development is not much different from what has been discussed in the last three or four years growing out of the whole manpower development and training program, the MDTA, the amendments and the OEO and so on. This is, how do you recruit; how do you go about training people; how do you innovate and how do you bring about change? Change becomes an end in itself with very little purpose to what you are trying to accomplish which should be setting hard and fast criteria, measures of performance, accountabilities and evaluation. All of these are establishment terms, but they are needed. That is why we are down the road we are right now, because they weren't introduced in some other programs.

What I am concerned about is, who is going to start with the demand side of the equation? It has been too easy to talk on the supply side of manpower, but you must go to the demand side — absorption of rehabilitated people. I am not talking about your sixteen or eighteen year olds. I am talking in terms of the numbers that have to be counted and absorbed. The private sector is not going to take it all. That is the heart of this thing, and I haven't heard this approached at all.

J. D. GRANT: How are we going to develop new jobs and career opportunities in existing public systems? That's the question. It is time it came up.

I think you are entirely right. All of our present models have concentrated on developing the person. Job Corps has industry developing people, not creating jobs. Neighborhoods Youth Corps was vigorously defined as not job creation, but job experience. This implication was that if we modified people, the system would be able to take care of them.

The crucial issue that I sure hope we are talking about, is how do we change the system and create new kinds of programs with new kinds of jobs in them? I mean not only jobs, but career opportunities. And if we aren't talking about that, I am at the wrong meeting.

L. LEVINE: At the risk of hurting a lot of people's feelings, I would start off with the place to develop people is not in the schools and not in these agencies that are represented around this workshop but at work sites, in work environments, in which the schools, the social agencies and the other groups that are messing around are only supplemental tools and in no way substitutes for them.

Now, if that requires subsidizing or penalizing the private sector of the economy with respect to absorption, if it requires that in the public employment category, or in the nonprofit institutions, then that's what we should be approaching. But as long as we educate and train in areas outside the work environment, we still have a gap to bridge.

Change Through Staff Involvement — The New Jersey Experience

F. SCHENCK: Mr. Grant has asked me to speak briefly about what we were doing in New Jersey. We have taken a couple of pages out of his book. Through a grant provided by OEO, we had the resources to give the major state agencies the kind of personnel they need to take a "systems" look at their organization.

We approach the personnel office and work directly with the chief officers as well as the budget officer of each department, plus the budget director for the State of New Jersey and with the Civil Service Commission. By taking a look from the inside, we initiate a major job development approach at the same time, linking it to the kinds of new services that the agencies should be providing. Out of this grows a series of new job descriptions and some variations in all job descriptions which are then, with our help, funneled through the Civil Service agency and put into operation.

Now, as we get the system adapted to accepting new ways of doing business, we are also taking an active role in the development of training programs that are necessary to train entering nonprofessionals. I don't particularly like the phrase "New Career." I prefer to call it career development.

When we look, for example, at a job, we may create a sub-entry level position, but that position is created with regard to all of the other jobs in that job family. I think it is shortsighted if we simply look at an entry level position and think of it as a method of getting people into the system without saying how far they can go and how much movement needs to be put on the top position in order to make the system more effective and the job family more elastic.

Our hope, of course, is to forge a tie between the Civil Rights organizations and the community action agencies so that people can be quickly moved into the system, in some cases, into entry-level positions, and in other cases, above the entry level, depending on the qualifications of the applicants. We are not looking exclusively to fit the disadvantaged applicant in every case at the bottom of the ladder. Some of those ladders are so low that even the disadvantaged can move two or three rungs up at the outset.

Our attempt is to make the establishment look at the job in realistic terms. Some job specifications have been in existence and duplicated for forty years. Job studies have not been properly conducted. So, we throw out the paper qualifications and write a description based on the actual duties being performed on the job. Now as we get to the question of who is going to finance these positions, it is a little easier in our operation, because we know a bit more about the budget process than perhaps about others. But money is usually available from vacancies, positions that haven't been filled.

This is particularly appealing to the personnel officer who is faced with the problem of staffing and keeping his positions filled. In most cases, we are able to show them that they've got balances in the salary account that can be quickly converted to financing a sub-entry-level position. As the trainee moves to higher accomplishment, that money is simply reallocated to the permanent spot.

S. SADOFSKY: Mr. Schenck, in approaching the personnel officers of a Civil Service Commission at the state level or wherever, do you request a joint involvement with him in a redesign of his jobs or do you approach him with a new set of job specifications and ask him, well, what do you think of these?

F. SCHENCK: Again, we are working from within. We do not try to impose our ideas on job creation on him. We let him discover things by our doing a survey of his operations. The resource person that is assigned to him actually serves as one of his staff. We have only modest supervision over them. We conduct weekly training courses, for example, but we let the line personnel and the line budget people figure out what choices they can make with the suggested new positions.

In other words, they are involved in the planning. When we wrote the project, we brought in the Civil Service Commission as a partner. We realized that it had been in business for 52 or 53 years and had been more concerned with its role as a regulatory agency, to the detriment of its ability to plan and day-to-day knowledge about the functions being conducted in the agencies.

We are able to talk in the language of the personnel guy, but also in the language of the line supervisor who needs this work performed and lays out the actual duties of the job, so that there is no hanky-panky about paper qualifications, as opposed to the real qualifications for the job. I think this is one of the turning points in this operation.

S. KESTENBAUM: I wanted to ask Mr. Grant something. In one of your procedures for effecting institutional change, you mentioned something about in-service training of current staff. I wondered if there wasn't another implication for professional education, so that you don't have to re-adapt when the professional starts to work for you. What has been the connection with the professional institution and what is our obligation?

J. D. GRANT: Some interesting things came out in the planning for the current new careers project. Initially we were thinking of using professionals part-time and then of using our trainees without formal college training full-time to augment services.

While we were considering this, a sociologist at USC, who was in on some of the planning said, "Good God, if we are on the right track, the model for the future is for the professional to be working largely with and through these non-college developed trainees. Shouldn't we be started in our models at least to try to think of some way to short cut the business of sending people clear through universities and graduate school, which in many ways explicitly and in a tremendous number of other ways implicitly, encourages them to get as far as possible away from the non-college graduate. They develop their own value systems, their own group and their own frame of reference and so on? Then, as soon as we give them a degree, if we are on the right track, we should retrain them immediately to get back to the world as it really is. So shouldn't we start at least exploring ways of doing this?"

S. JACOBSON: A hopeful note may be that the Graduate School of Arts and Humanities at Yeshiva University is now planning a community mental health program within the graduate school which will involve the training of its graduate students along with training nonprofessionals, so that by training jointly they will hopefully learn from each other.

Change in Institutions

M. HERMAN: With regard to strategies for implementing the new programs and basing it on some of our experiences, I get the sense that much of the success in California may have been related to the selection of one system to work on. I think the corrections system is where it started.

Would you suggest from the standpoint of what you have seen and what you know, that as new programs get under way, as the strategy for bringing about changes in local communities evolves, would you recommend that we pick a target, meaning a system, that is vulnerable, on the basis of the two criteria that you mentioned. One, that there is youth and development in that system and, secondly, that maybe there is some uneasiness that the system is failing with regard to the quality of the service that it provides —?

J. D. GRANT: And able to express.

M. HERMAN: Or at least willing to express, and that we pick out such a target, instead of a more across the board kind of effort at the local level for implementing these programs?

J. D. GRANT: Oh, yes.

C. CARR: How do you get the different systems to agree?

J. D. GRANT: This is part of it. We obviously can't do everything, you know, as we stated yesterday, and I think it is very crucial for us to make optimal use of the resources that are available. I think the worst use is to just create more deadend jobs where people are moved, made disgusted, and so on. I think our strategy ought to be concerned with modifying systems. That should be our number-one objective.

On the other hand, we can't just go hitting our heads against blank walls, you know. We don't want this to be any harder than it has to be, particularly with our limited resources. I think we ought to be looking for a place where there is a readiness to move with us, and it seems to me that the place to start is where they've got mandates, as expressed in money, such as Medicare money, Title I, Title III money, the money that I am almost sure will come out of this Joint Manpower Commission, etc. Now these people are ready to do business with us, because they have needs. So we use what priming money we have to help them explore new kinds of models to meet very real problems.

From there I guess we approach the agency people who are able to face the fact that they need and want to do something different, and so on. I think this kind of strategy is extremely important.

Let me just add one thing more. I also think that even with our limited resources, it would pay us to reserve a fair amount of time for doing some very hard thinking among ourselves with reasonable people. I think it was this kind of thinking that you were suggesting on the Civil Service-type approach.

J. FISHMAN: I would like to try to play the role of theorist here for a moment, because I think a little theory is perhaps necessary. We have been shifting back and forth in our focus about the meaning of New Careers. I want to side step the issue of whether or not sub-professionals are identical with New Careers for the moment.

We are talking about New Careers. One of the most fascinating and difficult aspects of new careers is the attempt to draw together theoretically and practically what have been, up to this point, fairly disparate elements of our public agencies, public policy, welfare, and health and education components in our society.

The principle that is involved in this is perhaps tripartite. Employment and change, as goals in themselves, are very tiny parts of this. No change is good in itself unless it is goal directed. Employment may be good only in a very temporary sense, as with the WPA kind of experience. Employment, as such, is not a goal, unless it has certain other attributes.

One, of course, is employment at a reasonable level in society. Another aspect has to do with permanence. Another aspect has to do with a future. Employment has got to have a future, whether it is a future as President of the United States or future as a supervisor.

The education part is clearly a fundamental part, but is only one element. The third element is a lot more revolutionary in its implications, and Mr. Grant has been alluding to it, but it hasn't been laid out on the table clearly enough. I'd like to try to discuss it.

We are talking about the reorganization of services, and employing the poor to do this. The implication in terms of developing a "welfare state" in this society is the concern with a number of aspects of citizens' lives, particularly the lives of the disadvantaged.

The welfare model in which I include health, education, welfare, rehabilitation, the range of services — has been based on a concept of people who have made it giving to the people who haven't made it — certain kinds of services, helping them to make it, largely through giving them something.

The relationship is one of giver and given, one of the person who is in power doing something for the person who is dependent on him. In this kind of model, whether it be mental health, health, education, welfare or whatever, the person at the receiving end is completely put at a disadvantage. That relationship automatically screens out all but the people who were ready to do things to begin with, who could make it, the cream of the crop.

This is by now well known in certain areas like mental health, where we have found, much to our dismay, that most mental health services don't work. When they do work, it is usually through the use of drugs or at the level of mobilizing people who are all ready to be mobilized on to the next step.

This dependency relationship that has become a fundamental part of the human services segment of our society has a losing game built into it. We are talking about New Careers in the revolutionary sense, New Careers in the sense of turning this relationship around, bringing the people who have been on the receiving end into the role that previously had been reserved only for those already advanced in society, namely the professional which, incidentally, is a major employment area for the middle class in our society.

We are talking about turning it around and bringing these recipients, these dependent people, into a role where they are no longer depedent, where they are now participating as active partners in the process of change, of rehabilitation ,toward improving their own backgrounds, in a number of systems, including education. Education is not a process where a person listens and absorbs what he can through lectures, but actually participates with the teacher in learning, and it is this old classic model that we have lost sight of.

And this applies to all the other human services. This implies that we are actively working to erase the need for welfare services by employing people to do a variety of tasks in the community that involve human services. If this is successful, it really means turning around the whole process of the giver and the given and, for the first time, taking an approach to rehabilitation, training, and so on, that might really be effective.

What Mr. Grant has been saying, in reviewing his experiences with small groups is not so much that he has been successful in employing sixteen people, eighteen people or that we have been successful in employing a hundred people, but that we have used this process and found that it is most successful in getting people on their feet and putting them in a position where they begin to do the things that we formerly excluded them from doing, and where they were formerly in a situation of being dependent on others.

This is the real key theoretical issue here and it pervades the employment bit, pervades the education bit, the counselling part of this.

G. BOWMAN: I think this is really the guts of what we are all here for, and I heartily applaud it. I would like to stretch this a bit more, because if we are to plan together with those who have a stake in it and as partners, not like welfare, I think it is equally important that we avoid fragmented planning in the community as a whole.

The American Management Association and the NAM sit over there planning about creating new jobs in terms of their goals and we sit here, and the AFL-CIO sits elsewhere planning. So I think it is very important that we get together the people for whom we are planning in with all the groups that have been planning in the past, and also that we recognize those few within private industry who are concerned with social planning.

Equitable Life Assurance Society, for example, has created new jobs for the disadvantaged, has taken on offenders and has been successful at it, despite the fact that they lost money when they were first developing these jobs. I think we ought to have Equitable's Personnel Director and Vice President in charge of personnel, at a conference of this kind to tell how private industry went about their program and made it work. Then perhaps we will get to the point of not only training people for jobs, but creating new jobs that will be suitable for people and will also provide the new and needed services.

R. LEEDS: Whereas on a theoretical level it may seem that public service employment, new careers, will eliminate dependency, I think that in practice dependency will be fostered in many of these jobs.

One of the things that bothered me about new careers is what I would consider the feudalist aspects of it. I cite, for example, the New York City public service careers program, in which jobs titles like "Friendly Visitor" or "Program Aide" or "Neighborhood Aide" would begin at $2,750, and to which welfare clients would be assigned. The indication is that these people will obviously need supplementary public assistance. However, we can also get some public service from them.

This strikes me as being a very feudalistic concept. The question that people in the Social Service Employees Union raise — who have looked at the proposal — is what happens if a person refuses one of these low paying jobs in "public service" to which he will be referred from the New York State Employment Service or from the Department of Welfare? If a person hands out circulars for the Welfare Department, will he not conceive of himself simply as a fellow from the Bowery who hands out circulars for some other private concern?

Now, if a person refuses this type of employment, his case can be closed or his unemployment insurance can be cut off. Therefore, he would be very dependent upon the state, not only for his job, which he will have had no part in creating. I don't see any "maximum participation of the poor" in planning what kind of jobs they will do. So we are patrons in this aspect, just as much as in the creation of welfare grants.

J. FISHMAN: Only the first round though. Once you employ these people and bring them into the system, you are not patrons any more, and that is the big difference. You are only patrons at this very early stage, when you are trying to formulate the program. Once you bring them in, that system changes. That is a point that I should have added.

I think Mr. Grant's experience has been the same as ours in this respect. Once you bring these people into the small agency or the large agency, that agency isn't the same any more. You have changed your entire orientation, and you have begun a process of change in orientation for your entire staff.

Although there is the danger, however, that they may over-identify and then wind up removing themselves from the people they first identified with, and this is something we have to deal with. Nonetheless, it does change the whole system, again not change for change's sake, but change in the direction of vastly improving the services through a process of reorienting what the services are all about.

Please let me emphasize that I was making a theoretical statement. There are a lot of steps and years between now and the time when this will really be a meaningful thing in society.

R. LEEDS: I would disagree with that, because what you assume is that a new career ladder will be established. Here again, aside from what one can do in theory, I call attention to what we have seen in the New York City Public Service Careers Program — perhaps this isn't the ideal situation, but this is the kind of thing to guard against.

For instance, a position like Friendly Visitor, who goes to a nursing home and cheers up the patients there and in homes for the aged — his career is a friendly visitor. That's the name of the job, Friendly Visitor, and then you progress to becoming an Institutional Aide.

One of the problems is that if you have a highly specialized job, then you are not creating the whole man, which is one of the processes of education, going to college, etc., rather than just a specific job skill, which is not really transferable to other occupations, so the person is dependent upon the job he is getting.

In one respect, one can look at this whole new career service as sort of a Barry Goldwater type approach to a solution to the welfare problem. What you are doing is that you are emphasizing equality of opportunity, but you are not really emphasizing equality. What you are saying is that now we are going to have new careers; so, if a person fails he has only himself to blame. But the opportunity structure is inadequate for his mobility.

J. FISHMAN: That is a misinterpretation of what I am saying. I am saying that the jobs and the job structure and the career structure have to be fitted to people, not people to jobs which is the usual model. Which means those who have the qualifications make it and everybody else drops out. Well, you know, that's poor people. They just don't have it.

R. LEEDS: I have one question. Have there been any projects where large numbers of persons have progressed from entry positions up to something like a nurse or a doctor, things that we theorize about, or has all the experience been only in creating entry jobs?

J. FISHMAN: As I indicated yesterday, a good nine-tenths of the experience in the last two or three years has been entry, and we have not been terribly successful at this point. We haven't devoted that much effort to vertical mobility. That's the key issue. I agree with you.

I am talking again theoretically about what is needed and not what has been accomplished. I think Mr. Grant pointed out a way in which he has been successful in his experimental programs in moving people up the ladder. This hasn't been tried yet on an organized mass basis.

W. DENHAM: I have a couple of points to make here. I am very conservative, when it comes to taking discussions on job development to this level of abstraction. You are really talking about macroscopic changes, changes that cut across the whole parameter of public policy issues, many of which, from an ideological point of view, I am thoroughly in accord with. But as a social planner, I always have to ask myself what can we achieve in five year, ten years, fifteen yars. My feeling on this is no mystery to my colleagues, that I don't think we really have yet come up with the answer to how we can get this massive breakthrough. I think when we hit the system with the Scheuer Amendment, there will be a little breakthrough, but very little.

What I am saying is that we really ought to give some thought to how we set up a planning system that can, in a sense, breakdown these desired macroscopic goals, small action systems, that permit the mobility we talk about and the real ladders within systems which have a built-in evaluation and feed back that go far beyond the things that we have tried to do.

L. LEVINE: It has only been a deade or so that we have recognized that the economy has really moved into an entirely different sphere. It is a service economy. From the eighteenth century and industrial revolution, we were a production economy, and so far as occupational ladders were concerned, they were developed for manufacturing and production, not for services.

The simple truth is all of us are talking about ideals. The most important single occupation right now — in my book — for developing career ladders is an occupational analyst. They are very few and far between. They are not economists, not sociologists, but occupational analyst, who can take a job, break it down into all of its minute elements and tasks, so that you find what is professional, what isn't professional, what truly requires formal schooling, etc.

There are plenty of jobs that do require schooling. I want no doctor or surgeon messing around with me who came out of a disadvantaged crew. I will tell you that.

An occupational analyst should begin studying the occupations in the service economy that is what we have been talking about here, health, correctional institutions and all service categories. That's where the opportunities are going to develop, but we don't know enough about them. Until we start with the factual, technical knowledge, building in this other stuff is just throwing money down the drain, and that is what has been happening in the last four or five years on a number of projects.

C. CARR: We have loved America for the self-made man, and I don't see many guys who started out, you know, as an automobile welder and worked themselves up to be the guiding spirit of our new Human Resources Administration.

Now, I don't care if the doctor came from a disadvantaged area, so long as he worked hard and went through the necessary steps.

I don't see putting the aide into the doctor's job. That's silly. I think new careers means that the aide — and this requires a great deal more motivation than most people have — can believe that she can get to be a nurse. That's not so farfetched. We have always thought that.

G. HODGES: Well, this doesn't have to do with Civil Service, but there were a couple of remarks made about private industry, and I just thought I would say this. There isn't as much private industry as we sometimes think. Let me tell you an experience I had. Here I am in a regional office of the United States Civil Service Commission. I sent a man up to Parkchester — that's the big apartment house development in the Bronx — to sit down with the manager and go over his employment promotion, training, practices and so on, with a view to equal employment.

We went back a year later and saw an improved picture and we will continue to go back. What am I doing up at Parkchester? Parkchester is owned by Metropolitan Life Insurance Company which owns a piece of a government contract that happens to be run by the Civil Service Commission. They have what is probably a small piece of money, but it is a government contract, so we are on their heels, and they actually have changed their hiring practices.

I think a good deal of the changes toward equal employment in private industry flows from this. When you look at our own contracts and look at the tremendous contracts from the Department of Defense, Interior and others, and when these terms are made on their contractors, there is a lot of power backed up by the United States. If it can be exercised on behalf of equal employment, somebody may find a way to exercise it for this purpose, too.

G. GOLDBERG: I don't really know if I can respond in a coherent fashion to some of the diverse things I have heard. However, I feel that creating jobs that are permanent jobs is not necessarily to be scoffed at. And we haven't really done that. We have said in all of these Job Corps and other employability programs that we are going to change the individual. I agree. The real hitch has been that there haven't really been jobs for them.

It is as if we have all of a sudden skipped way up to the moon on this. I don't think there is anything bad about having jobs. Most professionals have jobs that are just jobs, and some of them are time serving. I don't think there would be anything so terrible about this if we were doing it.

Now, that's one part of it. Second, I would like to change the service system and create New Careers, but I am not so sure that we can just throw all these eggs in one basket and say we can do it together. Perhaps very creatively, very systematically and in a very organized fashion we can combine these, but just because you begin to restructure and do other things, you are not going to do them all together.

The mere presence of poor people in agencies doesn't change these agencies. I would like to know where service structures have been changed to a considerable extent by the employment of nonprofessionals.

Finally, just what are the professionals going to do when we tell them all of a sudden that they aren't going to be donors? I just don't know. A lot of us who don't think we are in the establishment are going to feel we are, to our great surprise.

J. D. GRANT: Well, obviously we have a lot of feelings and a lot of concerns here. We are concerned with creating jobs, all of us, and with building career opportunities within the job.

I think the basic premise of all of us, has been that where jobs can be and will be created are in the professional fields. It is already very much in business, in the areas of human development and cultural development.

Now, as we expand this, we are going to get into all kinds of issues of how to do it effectively and how to prepare for it. Obviously a very great question is how much of this will be done by private industry. Private industry goes into the education field. Private industry goes into the arts, but that is the direction in which we are moving.

I thought we were agreed that Congressman Scheuer's bill gave us a foothold to try to make some systematic moves towards the kinds of thing that we are bound to face.

I think the one thing we know for sure is that as these new resources become available, and as we commit more of the national resources to this kind of thing, we are going to want to do it differently.

IV. IMPLICATIONS FOR IMPLEMENTATION — PRESENT AND PROJECTED MANPOWER PROGRAMS

The final workshop session was planned to focus on the current status of the implementation of the 1966 Scheuer (and the associated Nelson-Kennedy-Javits) amendment to the Economic Opportunity Act. On the day preceding this final session, a joint statement of the Labor Department and the Office of Economic Opportunity announced that the administration of the Scheuer-Nelson-Kennedy-Javits programs was to be delegated to the Labor Department and its newly created Bureau of Work Programs. The guide lines defining the terms of this delegation and the respective responsibilties of the Labor Department and OEO were then under discussion by a joint OEO-Labor Task Force. The guide lines were finally agreed upon and announced in February 1967. Some of the ensuing discussion has been deleted when it seemed to be outdated and not of particular background significance.

Remarks of Mrs. Roslyn D. Kane:
Office of Economic Opportunity

The experience of the OEO indicates that there are at least 42,000 sub-professionals employed presently by OEO. We are probably as an agency the largest employer of sub-professionals in the country.

We consider our experience to be merely a first step in this whole approach, because those who have been employed in the sub-professional capacity for Community Action programs and their delegate agencies are in a circumscribed situation in these new agencies with experimental points of view. We feel that now, the second step is about ready.

With the recent acquisition of several evaluations of performance of the sub-professionals, we have found that they are able to perform the sub-professional tasks, and in many cases perform it better than the professionals. This is our stand. These non-professional jobs do not have to be viewed merely as something good because they employ the poor. They are good in and of themselves, in that what they add to the public and the private agency is something beyond that which the professional has been able to deliver.

I will first talk about the kinds of jobs available.

First and primarily we are talking about Civil Service jobs that have not been filled. Our data indicates that there are a minimum of 500,000 budgeted and unfilled positions in the United States in county, municipal and state Civil Service.

There is a demand in the public service sector for persons who have been eliminated from jobs there because of lack of experience, academic qualifications, or because of hiring standards that have kept them from having access to these jobs. There are jobs for those who are trained for them.

Secondarily, the whole question of the aides in human services. We see this as a second major qualification. The critical shortage of professional staff indicates that the persons who suffer most are the poor themselves. The whole approach to new careers is important in that if nothing else, it will provide the human services to the poor that they greatly need.

The third category of jobs is what I call the new careers themselves, which is a new way of providing professional services, a totally new examination or organization of the way professional services are delivered. We see the program covering all three categories.

We do not feel that there is necessarily any conflict. There is a requirement for the involvement of the public and private agencies, the professional groups, the unions of public employees and the involvement of federal, state and local Civil Services.

Now, whom will we be serving? There has been much talk of creaming. Every single manpower program that I have ever been involved in has been accused of creaming, and I do not think that there is any final solution to creaming. However, the evaluations have indicated that choice of people is not deeply different if one chooses persons with two years of college or if we select persons who are school drop outs.

What is true of this program is true of all other manpower programs. The poor, the more hard core the poor, the more likely they will require specific supportive services, particularly at the beginning of the program. But this is part of any effort to work with the poor, to help them to move into the competitive world.

Except for that, there has been no real differentiation between the persons who have been drop outs and those that have not. We have high school drop outs who are, in fact, among the most motivated and striving of the group. They simply could not adjust to a specific school system, so even the number of years in school does not necessarily qualify the individual.

I agree that a good deal of thought has to be given to the whole question of recruitment and selection, but I do not think that the number of years of schooling is the major factor to be considered. Certainly we are talking now about bringing the poor into the program. The group we will serve at the point of intake will cover a broad spectrum, but basically they will be the unemployed who have not found any other access to appropriate employment.

Virtually all of the Community Action Agencies have employed sub-professionals. They already have outreach services by the sub-professionals into the community, and everyone has given us the major assurance that the poor themselves will be reached.

It is not going to be a self-selection process. If the Community Action Agencies are involved, certainly at the level of recruitment, they will reach out to the poor. However, the guidelines, prepared by OEO, prohibit any person employed by CAA's to be brought in to the Scheuer program.

The reason for this is that we see this as a major opportunity to break into the existing agencies. We feel we have proven the ability to utilize the sub-professional in the new agencies. We feel that this money must be used to act as a lever to break into, not only public employment opportunities, but also into the private, nonprofit agencies.

We have to break through and improve their service to the poor, for the private social agencies had tended to lose contact with the poor and deliver service to the middle class. We do hope that we will have new models of working with the private social agencies through the program.

Now as to the size of the program. OEO's guidelines state that a minimum of half-a-million dollars will be the size of any single program. The reason for this is very clear.

Number one, this limits this program to twenty-five or thirty programs in the United States. We feel that that is virtually all that the present professional capacity in this country is capable of mounting and mounting well. We also feel that it is essential that there be enough money involved to have an impact upon the agencies with whom we work, which means that we've got to have enough money to make it worth their while to make certain changes. Therefore, a half-a-million has been taken as our minimum proposal.

We are also anxious for visibility. That does not necessarily mean visibility among our professional groups, but rather public visibility. We feel that if we can do it in New York, then the smaller cities around New York will also be willing to try it. We feel that if we do it in California, we can do it in Oregon, Nevada and Arizona. The point of visibility is a very important point.

New careers has been a very exciting idea to the professional community, but basically has had extremely little visibility. We are anxious for this visibility, because we feel that this program can and will be a success, and through its success, it will encourage other groups to be willing to try.

We also believe we have an excellent opportunity at this moment to utilize these funds to have impact on other programs. New careers has almost gotten out of hand in the last year, it has been moving so quickly. The first study done by the Office of Education of 20,000 Elementary and Secondary Education Act grants in the local communities has indicated that there are five-thousand teacher aides already employed.

The thing that is most upsetting — and I am certain that this is most upsetting to those who have been looking at the teacher aides at the higher level — is that in almost all cases, the Office of Education indicates that these teacher aides are being employed, (a) without training; (b) with no training of the teachers who are expected to utilize them and, (c) that they are being used as janitor aides under so many different titles that one would be appalled to think about it. Although they are called teacher aides, they are not teacher aides as we should be talking about them.

We feel that a major impact can be made on the teacher aides programs by providing the training of the enrollees, the training of the teachers, the training of the administrators. We visualize this program as having a major impact on the teacher aides. Welfare aides by the way, is another area that is moving very, very rapidly, again without training and without the built-in ladders that we consider so important.

Now, there are a few very practical points of view that I would like to mention. OEO's report to the budget has placed $3,850 as the average cost per trainee, but in that cost we have taken into consideration, that many will be underwritten by the Elementary and Secondary Education Act (ESEA). Although we will be paying for the training, ESEA will be picking up the salaries once the original training is over. Medicare, for instance, will pick up the salaries after the training period. Welfare has already committed funds to picking up welfare aides, where we again hope to be doing the training. So, when we use the $3,850, this is an average amount.

Another issue that we have seen in OEO that has not been discussed very much is that the tendency has been to have this program predominantly a women's program.

I think this is a mistake. We do want to reach the men, and that for the men, the amount of the salary becomes very, very important. Perhaps this is an area where the cities, where the Civil Services, might be willing to consider underwriting the need for a higher level salary than the funds available under the poverty program.

One statement about training. As our guidelines are written, no proposal that does not include training, both prior to and admission to the job, continuing on-the-job training and training of the supervisors would meet our qualifications.

But our training has not been defined. There is a dearth of written curricula based upon the past several years of experience. This is an essential part of the program. We think that it is something that will have to be undertaken in the next few months on a crash basis.

Remarks of Mr. Mark Battle:
Neighborhood Youth Corps

We have a task force which is jointly staffed by OEO and Labor. It is seriously at work producing guidelines that we hope will provide the vehicle for directing and administering this new program.

So, let me deal with some of the concepts at work within the Department of Labor, with reference to these programs, and isolate some of the issues that we think are important issues to be dealt with in coming up with a plan for implementing the program.

First we have generally agreed that the notion behind the several programs should be a comprehensive manpower kind of program, affording a local sponsor with a variety of options, so that he is no longer caught on the horns of the dilemma of what to do with a youth when he is ready to move on to something else.

Second, we conceive of this as an opportunity to provide options to one sponsor through one contract, with a variety of components, rather than requiring him to enter into several contracts or grants. Obviously, like OEO, we have a commitment in conceiving of these programs with upward mobility related to the capacity and the choices of the individuals involved. This is an overriding concept in so far as we are concerned.

We have made a commitment that the essential services that are necessary to bring off the success of these programs, aside from the work and the skills training, should be regarded as inherent elements in the program rather than supportive services.

Now this is something of a major departure. Obviously it has implications for funding.

Another concept that we are committed to in relation to these programs is that of aggressive involvement in job development, with the notion of preparing the way for the hooking up of the people who come through these programs into the competitive employment arena, both public service and private industry.

The final concept that we have settled on very clearly is the specific tying together of the variety of manpower programs that do exist, including the new ones. There has been a good deal of experimentation within the Manpower Administration and in conjunction with OEO already in ways of linking MDTA, NYC, OJT and so forth. Happily this experience will serve as a very valuable base for some of the planning that is taking place now.

We are particularly concerned with how one identifies the objectives of these programs clearly enough and simply so that they can be realized and so that they can be measured.

Whatever we do, we've got to translate all the brainstorming into the kinds of specifics that represent standards you can expect a sponsor to produce. Also we've got to be able to identify, in the process of working with local communities, their commitment to getting the job done.

We are concerned about how you design a delivery system which really gives meaning to these objectives. There are a variety of sponsors of Neighborhood Youth Corps programs around the country, including Community Action Agencies. There are a variety of different kinds of Community Action Agencies, and within all of them, there are a variety of approaches to manpower development and utilization of services. We are not certain what is the best model for the delivery of these services.

We are taking a serious look at how you build in accountability. When Congressman Scheuer asks us questions when the hearings begin on the Hill in 1967, his questions are going to go to results, among other things, and we will need to be able to have accountability in the design for this program.

Obviously one of the important issues is the relationship with Community Action Agencies. It is not an issue in the sense of there being a clear legislative mandate for preference, or for full cooperation with the CAA's. It is an issue in terms of the extent to which in the planning of the program and the specifics of the program design one should conceive of community action agencies, in effect, as being the **only** resource for the mounting of these programs at the local community level. If they are not the **only** resource, what other primary local community resource should be utilized?

Another area of concern to us is the issue of how we can relate the evolving program in the subprofessional, nonprofessional aide, assistant, associate professional area with the private sector of the economy. It would seem to us that aside from the career potential in the public sector, there are skills and there are jobs which may well be developed and training opportunities which can be provided in the public sector which are transferable into the private sector of the economy.

We think that this needs to be explored, both for the value to individuals and for the value of the program itself. It is one of the items which we are thinking about seriously.

Finally the issue that is of concern to us is the issue of wage rates. How do you rationalize wage rates for programs of this sort when you have federal minimums, state minimums, union scales, traditions of pay for certain kinds of occupations and so forth? This has got to be thought through very carefully.

These are some of the several issues that are of concern to us as we try to design the guidelines for these programs.

DISCUSSION

Strategy of Implementation

M. HERMAN: Is it wise in your view, without wondering about numbers, that there should be a selective beginning with regard to those communities who are to be in the Scheuer program?

M. BATTLE: We think obviously there must be a selective beginning in the application of the Scheuer program. We think a selective beginning is wise, because the mounting of this kind of program involves a degree of job engineering that hasn't been done before. It calls for a fairly sizeable investment in order to bring it off. If we were talking simply about a public employment program or a publicly subsidized employment program, it would be a different matter. That is not what we are talking about and is not the conception of these programs.

M. MOED: Will the contracts go to the CAP's, let's say, one for each community that you pick, like in New York, will that go to the Human Resources Administration or is it to be like the Neighborhood Youth Corps model in which certain agencies are funded by the Neighborhood Youth Corps and others are funded through the city.

M. BATTLE: At this point we think in terms of a local sponsor, thinking of a medium-sized city having available to it the variety of options that these programs represent, and at the minimum overhead in terms of administrative expense. These are the considerations that lead us in the direction of one sponsor.

To the extent that this is not feasible in terms of delivery of service to people in that community, then this is not a route that should be taken. The fact of the matter is that a variety of local communities are already in the process of attempting to design programs involving the opportunities afforded under the Nelson-Scheuer Amendment, and under the Special Impact program.

The problem we are going to have is identifying those cities or communities that ought to have the first opportunity to take advantage of this. It is further complicated by the fact that the Scheuer-Nelson programs are going to be governed by the limits of Title II, the state allocation and the matching requirements. It is not going to be simple.

CONGRESSMAN SCHEUER: Mr. Battle, you posed the question "Is the Community Action Agency going to be considered the only resource?" I don't know whether you can consider the Community Action Agency to be a community coordinating agency, simply to expedite applications, or whether they will have a monopoly status as the only applicant?

Supposing a local school agency or local hospital or local police department for some reason or another wants to put that in the planning, and they don't want to work through the local Community Action Agency. What will their status be?

M. BATTLE: As of this moment there is a check point procedure which has been jointly agreed to by Community Action and the Neighborhood Youth Corps. That model is the model that we have proposed to date for this kind of situation.

There are several approaches in the relationship between a Neighborhood Youth Corps and Community Action. For example, in the City of Philadelphia, there is a hospital which is the sponsor of a program. There is also a Community Action Agency which is a sponsor of a program. The Community Action Agency, however, does have the responsibility of taking a look at the proposal by the hospital and indicating its endorsement before we do anything about it. They do not have a veto, but they do have the opportunity of saying whether they think it fits into the best plans of the city and so forth.

J. FISHMAN: Who would make the final decision as to whether or not this was an acceptable model according to the guidelines?

R. KANE: The delegation says the Department of Labor at headquarters.

L. LEVINE: At a first premise, assume the past history could be forgotten and differences between agencies and bureaucratic clashes overcome, and you were to proceed to what was really the congressional intent, and forgot Washington as the arena and focus attention on the local community.

The second premise is there is a small amount of money and because the program is likely to be limited to some twenty-five or thirty communities which will lay ground for getting much larger sums of money at a subsequent period.

The third premise is that no matter how well intentioned you may be when you employ disadvantaged for career development in human services on public pay rolls and ignore or minimize the participation of the private sector, you will be under attack. Anybody can put them on public payroll. The question is getting them on the private payroll.

The fourth premise is that in the local community, there presently exists a wide variety of facilities and public expenditures in the field of human resource development, public schools, vocational schools, MDTA and on-the-job training. The new program must not go on independently of these programs that are already operating. They must be interrelated. Therefore, the proposal of something approaching a manpower council, in which there is a private sector participation, is extremely important.

On the basis of these premises we could lay aside bureaucratic differences and focus on what is really the major objective of career development for nonprofessionals.

R. KANE: The proposal that has just been made is that the manpower agencies in the Federal Government should carry the planning that was started last year for the state MDTA beyond that to over-all planning for all programs funded by the federal establishment, $1.5 billion to be exact. This would provide that local coordinating committee that you are talking about.

In that area, I am quite certain that the Manpower Advisory Councils of MDTA and the new local coordinating committees will undoubtedly meet to start thinking about how MDTA specifically — since this is our major training resource — and all of these other programs can be utilized to provide the training and the development of new careers in the private sector.

I would still say that I am not convinced that the funds needed to establish new careers in human services should be the ones that should be utilized for this other equally important process. A very major push should be made in the private sector, but these are funds that are essential for the public sector.

The fact is that according to the employment service, the fastest expanding area of employment in the United States is the municipal and state governments, not the Federal Government. They are clamoring for assistance to provide trained people to fill those unfilled slots.

M. BATTLE: I support the idea of the manpower councils or commissions. I think one has to differentiate between the kinds of coordinating committees which are represented by either federal staff as a group, who come together to coordinate their efforts, or state staffs, which come together to coordinate their efforts, and the grouping of a variety of organizations which have an interest in these programs at the local community level.

This should be the kind of thing that I would think Community Action Agencies in local communities would be pushing for. It is clearly the intent, one of the basic purposes of the Economic Opportunity Act to mobilize all of the local community forces to identify and work at eliminating poverty.

Comprehensive Program Planning and Coordination

M. HERMAN: I wonder if you might comment upon the objective expressed earlier of conceiving of a contract that the Labor Department would like to create at the local level which provides a variety of options, so that one can provide as many avenues of development as seemed to make sense for an individual.

My question goes to the implementation of this notion. At the local level not only does one have trouble with negotiating the funding machinery for different programs, but even after having done that successfully, a local community that may be the sponsor of a so-called comprehensive program has three, four or more contracts to provide different options under different contractual arrangements. Such a sponsor may find himself with one of these contracts expiring in March and another one in April and another one in June. So in a so-called comprehensive program at any one time you may always be negotiating for one or more contracts either for funding or for renewal.

My question comes to this. If, in a local community, there is a sponsor trying to provide all of these options that you are referring to, would the Labor Department see itself as tearing up all existing contracts and saying to the sponsor "We want you to provide whatever services you can for whatever target populations you are serving? You don't have to worry about the fact that you are diverting your OJT job developer to the Neighborhood Youth Corps work."

Would there be any way, or is it deemed to be desirable, to implement this notion, say, by tearing up these piecemeal contracts? In a sense, writing one comprehensive contract that would provide for these options that all of us agree need to be provided?

M. BATTLE: Obviously that is the ideal towards which we are working. Our thrust would be to check out all the possibilities for doing it, rather than pointing up the reasons why it can't be done. There are lots of problems obviously, but I would think this is the direction one would hope to be able to move in.

H. KRANZ: In the beginning of MDTA, there were separate training projects approved institutionally, first one for auto mechanics and then when somebody decided we needed nurse's aides. We had a nurse's aide training program of twenty or more people, and so on.

This proved to be unproductive for a variety of reasons. One is that it was necessary to start out by putting twenty people, who may or may not want to be auto mechanics, into the only available course which happened to be auto mechanics. Further, they may have needed basic education, which was not available or feasible for ten people in a particular course. So, there developed, about the second or third year of MDTA, the notion of a multi-occupation training program, which is where most of the MDTA money is today. Under this system there are a variety of skill training possibilities with slots for, say, twenty auto mechanics, twenty teacher aides, twenty computer technicians, and so on.

They were approving all of this under an umbrella, for example, for five-hundred people, with twenty different occupations, twenty-five people each. Basic education, prevocational counselling, health care, etc., are provided in an exploratory period where the trainees can decide which of the twenty possibilities they want to get into. An agency is not stuck with twenty auto mechanics. If they find only eighteen people want to get slotted into auto mechanics and twenty-two into teacher aide, they have that flexibility in the program, within the over-all approval of the multi-occupation MDTA.

Do you see that kind of possibility developing in the work training program as you talk about giving options to the agency and also, in a tense, giving more options to the target group.

M. BATTLE: A similar principle and it is a similar concept — definitely.

R. KANE: Unfortunately there is not one single teacher aide program in all the state MDTA plans. It is important in that MDTA has virtually not addressed itself to a new career plan. The whole idea of total planning in the states under a continuation of the state MDTA plan offers great flexibility to permit a local coordinating committee to deal with the total problem in its community and to come up with some over-all considerations six months prior to the start of funding, which can provide for a much more logical approach to manpower needs.

There is still no feasible single agency at the top that can deal with all of the funding resources available to manpower. Even if there were such an agency at the top, the differentiation of problems from city to city is so great that nobody at the federal level can possibly deal appropriately with any single city, even a fairly small one that you are intimate with.

Therefore, I think that much more relevant to coordinated over-all planning is the push of the Department of Labor to the over-all manpower plan. I think that it is a gigantic task. I think it will take us several years to get it on the road properly, but that this is the great hope, rather than any single bureau or single department trying to do it at the federal level.

A. VOGEL: Looking at this from a nationwide point of view for the moment — in medium-sized cities, for example, when you had a manpower coordinating and planning council, such as you have described, what has happened is that no matter what a local group has come up with, there is a state level decision-making body that comes back and says "This is it". You talk about state career planning, and then in the next breath you talk about local career planning and the two, so far, in history have not meshed.

Is there any way in which one can begin to have a little more focus on the locally defined needs of a community when the federal government decides how there is going to be an over-all plan for that community?

M. BATTLE: This is the specific intent of the revisions in the state plan, as they are being developed now within the Manpower Administration. The guidelines for state planning, as they are being developed now, seek to provide for the flexibility that is necessary to assure that local communities have an input and get an output in relation to their peculiar needs.

R. KANE: It is a very important point that although the proposal of the Manpower Administration was not accepted, all nine departments and agencies that sat on the task force that examined the document — did approve the concept, which meant that all of them were willing to put their own funds into this over-all plan.

This is the first time that anything of that size has ever been attempted.

HEW, the Office of Education, and the Office of Welfare were represented and agreed. Our understanding is that the Public Health Service is also willing to put the Health Manpower Planning in with the over-all plan. This is the first time that anything of this magnitude has even been accepted at the federal level.

M. BATTLE: We shouldn't let another reality pass unspoken, and that is the fact that the development of a comprehensive manpower program is going to demand a more meaningful relationship between the community and state.

It can be an opportunity, but only to the extent that the local community insists on participating can you be certain that it is going to be a participant.

S. LESH: Under this one contract idea, particularly as it concerns training, will there be a coupled nature to this? Such as the present MDTA programs are being coupled with the Office of Education, which handles the institutional training, and the Department of Labor handling the OJT training.

M. BATTLE: "Coupling" is certainly one of the options.

S. LESH: May I make a recommendation that you do away with that coupling, if possible, because there is tremendous trouble with states on this, particularly with the state education departments? We went through the process and found out it took us six months — after we got approval — to get the final contract.

M. BATTLE: Let me seek clarification here. Are you suggesting that we go another route in terms of this whole range of manpower programs or just those that we are concerned about under the new Scheuer-Nelson-Kennedy-Javits amendments?

S. LESH: We are talking about the new amendments. I am concerned that it will go into that same procedure and that your statement about one contract sufficing for all will not apply because of a coupled nature in it.

In other words, the education department has the say on institutional training, and if you combine institutional with on-the-job training as most of the programs now are tending to, you've got both elements in there. So you have to abide by state educational regulations, which may mean for private agencies getting licenses as schools, which in and of itself is a long-term process, as well as working with MDTA, BAT and the Employment Service. You say one contract, but in effect it can be three or four with the same problems that three or four different contracts run into.

M. BATTLE: I must admit that it is possible for this kind of situation to develop and exist, and it would seem that it could critically influence the whole concept of the one contract with a variety of options.

On the other hand, it is an opportunity to focus attention on this as a gap or a problem area and deliver the specific remedial force that is necessary. Clearly within our intent is the notion that the local communities need to be served, and if that means working with the state education people to bring about what is necessary, that is exactly what it implies.

L. LEVINE: In the criteria or guidelines suggested the feasibility of accomplishment of objectives is included. There were a whole series of steps in the design of the project which had to be satisfied. Now surely this one would have to be met.

M. BATTLE: It is critical.

L. LEVINE: If you face the issue of whether a private agency should substitute itself for a public institution in the field of education, which is the conflict between public school systems, this is the kind of thing that needs to get resolved early or you are surely going to run into the kind of delays that you want to avoid.

Program Sponsorship

R. LEFFERTS: Whose pay roll will the employees be on? I am not talking about staff people, but rather the trainees, the nonprofessionals.

M. BATTLE: They will be on the pay roll of the local sponsoring agency. Now, when you say pay roll, you see, you have to be clear to separate that from the pay roll of the staff of the local sponsoring agency.

R. KANE: I would say at the suggestion of OEO, they should be on the pay roll of the employing agency.

R. LEFFERTS: The thing that concerns me is related to the orientation or philosophy with which the Scheuer Amendment is specifically approached. I look at it from the point of view, not of the operating problems of those who are going to have to administer it perhaps, but from the point of view of the individuals who will be employees or trainees, as well as from the point of view of those people who will be the employers in public agencies and nonprofit agencies.

This goes to the question of who would be the paymaster for the employee or trainee, because I think this is a critical factor that reflects the orientation that one has towards the whole program. I was surprised to hear Mr. Battle's reply that the paymaster was going to be the local sponsoring agency. I hope that's not a frozen position.

The reason I am concerned is that I think it does reflect one's orientation towards the program as another welfare program. Somebody is going to "do good" for somebody, and a local Community Action Agency or some other local group is going to get together a group of so-called underprivileged people and give them some money and then place them out someplace where they are going to perform certain tasks.

This, to me, does not reflect what I understood was the Congressional intent of the Scheuer Amendment. It certainly doesn't reflect what I think the unemployed people, at least the few thousand of unemployed people that we have talked to recently, want. What they want is a fullfledged, honest job.

It also doesn't reflect what employers are looking for, because they want employees to do certain tasks and they want to be able to control those employees. In talking to hundreds of employers, one of the things they keep telling us is that when it gets to this kind of a program, they don't want the same kind of thing that they have had in the Neighborhood Youth Corps. That might have been all right for the Neighborhood Youth Corps. I am not trying to say it wasn't, but they are saying for this kind of a program that they don't like that. They want these people to be real employees, subject to the disciplines, the controls and hopefully the help that a good employer gives his employee.

Now, am I missing something in your presentation, that you have a different approach or orientation to this program than that what I have just described? If not, then I wish you could develop further the reasons why you see the paymaster being a local sponsoring agency, rather than the agency in which the trainee or employee is placed.

M. BATTLE: If your question went to the issue of who gives the employee his check, you know, we have no frozen position on who gives him his check at all. From our point of view, if the Community Action Agency is the recipient of the money, we hold that organization responsible.

Now, if there are twenty-five different employers within that program and the arrangement calls for the Community Action Agency to make available funds to those employers by way of, let's say, subcontracts to provide employment for X number of people, with the appropriate training in terms that we have been discussing here, there is no problem with that employer playing the role of paymaster. Still, in our terms, the Community Action Agency is responsible. So, when I answered you in terms of who is the paymaster, I was thinking in terms of the organization we hold responsible for the delivery.

D. YANKELOVICH: From an ideal point of view, without taking into account some of the realities, but ideally, what kind of cooperation would you like to have from the private sector, if you could sort of write your own ticket in terms of the kind of help and cooperation that you feel would be maximally effective in helping engineer new jobs, in creating new careers? How would you like industry to cooperate? What would you like them to do?

M. BATTLE: I would think, for example, it would be vital that industry play a very specific role in the beginning, in the planning in the local community. Every local community ought to develop a manpower council of some sort, which is representative not only of the employing arena, including private industry, but representative of other elements in the community, and that kind of commission would concern itself with manpower policy, with manpower development, with manpower utilization, and might even become concerned with those aspects of economic development which have a direct bearing on the ability of that community to produce a sufficient number of jobs for the people who live in that community. This is a beginning point for their involvement.

D. YANKELOVICH: Yesterday Professor Riessman said this point of private industry participation has been mentioned a great deal, but nobody has ever said how to do it.

I would just like to make one minor point on that. With the exception of some window dressing and some real participation, say, in the Job Corps and a few notable exceptions, they have never been asked. One way to get some people to do something is to ask them, you know.

I would just like to throw out to this group that if certain segments of private industry were asked and asked in ways that were realistic and at the beginning, rather than having to sprinkle holy water on a fait accompli, there would be, surprisingly to many people, great receptivity to this kind of participation in this problem.

R. KANE: I would say that the Vice President, who has gone from city to city requesting participation from private-industry, does not quite agree with you that private industry has not been asked. This has been a major commitment of the Vice President. I do believe that the Department of Labor and OEO and the Vice President have more than offered every opportunity for cooperation from private industry.

Second, there is a difference here between the Department of Labor and OEO. We are fully committed to career restructuring in the private sector. We would hope, however, that the very limited amount of funds under Scheuer would not have to be utilized for this purpose. There are 125,000 job slots for OJT already funded under MDTA. It is almost inconceivable that the Bureau of Apprenticeship and Training can go from the 40,000 slots they had last year to the 125,000 slots they are allocated this year.

We feel that the emphasis in Scheuer should be towards new careers, new human services, and that a major aspect of the program, not a by-product, is the improvement of human services for the poor. For example, we have a very interesting proposal from a management consulting firm in Chicago that wants to take the same kind of training presently given to neighborhood workers to train supervisory personnel in private industry, in foreman positions, supervisory positions, using the same kind of training. We are interested in this proposal. We would not want to use the limited funds available under this program which the legislation, was not intended to be utilized for this purpose.

As part of the over-all manpower program in any city, we think that OJT funds can adequately cover the private sector.

The Role of Educational Institutions

T. ALT: What kind of response would you like and what kind of response do you expect from local schools, school systems and from the universities and junior colleges?

M. BATTLE: Let me start at the top of the list. I think at this time particularly, universities, colleges and junior colleges, can make a tremendous contribution to this whole effort. To the extent that they have engaged in any experimentation or organized thinking about this program, they can make available the results of that experimentation or organized thinking to the Department with reference to the planning process that is now under way.

Secondly, there is a real role for the universities and colleges to play as training sites or as training instruments in a local community to the extent that they exist in relation to a local community. Some of them have demonstrated this already in small measure.

We would like the school systems to get around to the business of playing their proper roles in relation to these kinds of young people. Playing their proper roles, from our point of view, includes recognizing the absolute need for young people to become related to the economy as producers, but also to take a real role in manpower development.

This is one of the reasons why the agency that is primarily concerned with manpower should operate the in-school program.

R. KANE: I would certainly agree. Number one again is our quest for all information from you who have been involved in experimental programs. We are really astonished at the small amount of written material that is available.

Secondarily again, we do see the community colleges, the colleges and the universities, as a major training resource.

Certainly this is one of the places that we would hope there would be a real involvement in the planning of the teacher aide program, that available training could be incorporated into the ESEA proposals. We are also hoping that the schools, particularly those schools in the poverty areas, would consider undertaking and moving in with the Community Action Agency to plan the programs for the utilization of teacher aides.

We also feel that there are several other school oriented kinds of classifications. For instance, the attendance worker is probably a logical next step for the work that has been done by our neighborhood worker outreach program. We feel that there have been very little utilization of sub-professionals as attendance workers, and we think this is a logical next step.

There are many others. We would hope the schools, particularly those in the poverty area, would start planning for a broadening of their program and of the utilization of specific training for that purpose.

Program Goals and Priorities

M. MEZOFF: We are beginning to talk about finally developing a whole total community approach. Also by implication then we are talking about sharpening the focus and goals on things like the Neighborhood Youth Corps and other programs. Inevitably it must also sharpen the goals of the nonprofessional careers program.

We are dealing with this thing in two different ways. For example, unless I am mistaken, the Scheuer Amendment is going to deal with just a small phase of the total movement or program of nonprofessional careers. What will also happen is that this program then at the community level will be part of a continuum of alternatives for individuals that come into a reception center and then referred to whatever type of program best suited for them.

In the light of the fact that this is part of a larger nonprofessional careers program and is to be part of a continuum of opportunities, and that there is a limited amount of money, what would be the best kind of utilization, at this stage, of the nonprofessional careers program limited funds? Does there need to be heavy emphasis on training at this particular time, for example?

What would you say is the best and most productive use — at this particular stage of development — for this money?

R. KANE: In attempting to determine what was available in the community and what technical resources we have to assist the communities, we have immediately discovered that there are major problem areas and that there are major needs.

We have already moved toward providing technical assistance to the communities preparing programs to utilizing the know-how that already exists to assist the communities to think through some of the major problems that we have identified here.

I would say the next major factor is training because you can't start training without some kind of a training plan. Training the supervisory trainers is the first major need, and we are trying to get at least a little lead time on that. The whole question of job development has been identified as being another major area of emphasis. There is no question about it, that there are not many people who have had experience in this new careers area. To repeat the priority needs: first, technical assistance and, second, training and, third, job development. I am not certain in what order.

H. KRANZ: It is easy for us to say we are interested in both improving services for people and getting the poor into subprofessional and nonprofessional jobs. We have almost an equal interest, but if the goal is primarily improved services, then maybe you don't need solely to involve the poor in providing the services.

On the other hand, if your major goal is providing new careers for the poor, then perhaps the services to be provided can go beyond services for the poor.

The second point, the titles you give the jobs have important implications for the success of your program, for what the people do, for the money you are going to get and a lot of other things.

My last point is I hope to go away from this conference thinking it was not a conference on the Scheuer Amendment. This was a conference on nonprofessional use, training, selection, new careers. There are many such programs that have been in existence for a while and that are in existence today. The teacher aide has been in our society for a number of years. The counsellor aide has been trained under MDTA. The Citizens Crusade Against

Poverty, a privately funded group, has gotten $3 million from Ford and elsewhere to train several thousand helper aides in the next couple of years. There are many programs concerned with the use of aides that we are going to have to deal with in the administration of this particular program, and we shouldn't exclude these others from our thinking.

G. BOWMAN: My comment also has to do with goals. While I applaud the tendency to think in coordinated terms and to stress linkage — a master plan for a community — I also fear that as we view it only in terms of a master plan, that we might forget some of the differentiation that is needed.

For example, do we have to say that a given city would have, as its major goal for all the activities in which they would use auxiliary personnel, the goal of services or the goal providing needed employment. There are some activities which are task oriented and there are some that are people oriented. A teacher aide in the classroom, for example, would need different qualifications and the goals and the selection criteria would be different than for, say, someone who runs a ditto machine.

We have to differentiate and see that we can serve many goals and in one type of activity, one goal may be uppermost rather than trying to lump everything into one category.

M. BATTLE: As I conceive of the new careers movement, the opportunity and the responsibility is broader than simply new careers for the poor. I conceive of the new careers for the poor part of it as being strictly related to that part which is publicly subsidized. So when we talk about how much money is available, we talk about how much money is available to subsidize new careers for the poor. I would hope we are not simply talking about the creation of new careers only to be occupied by poor people.

Problems in Implementation

W. DENHAM: There are enormous implications in terms of the occupational engineering consideration. I would not feel equipped as a "pro" to go into a community and give them hard, useful, functional advice as to how to approach this program problem of job re-engineering. I am not talking about just addition and subtraction of functions. It is much more complicated than that.

Depending on the extent to which we can move into the area of job restructuring in this first year, would it be very useful if we could have a conference on this? What is job re-engineering? What sectors are we talking about? Aren't there variables in this area of job re-engineering? Can there be a pattern of job re-engineering for the whole human service field in the whole country or are there patterns that are more functional in one area than another?

M. BATTLE: Can't we take what little we know and have learned in the last couple of years and really begin to use it to develop an approach that will mean more effective consultation with the community?

M. MOED: This job engineering task is difficult. In the two days of discussion here about new careers nobody has presented a new careers model. I get a sense that it is possible that when you get a call from Congressman Scheuer inquiring how many people you placed, you are liable not to have placed many because you will be busy job engineering, which you should be. If you go the other approach, then I get the sense that you might just have another Neighborhood Youth Corps, which you said is not what you want for this.

Job engineering is a tremendous task, and in a way I am glad to hear that you are going through the cities, because I don't think any agency has the clout to get state and city and federal Civil Service to begin changing the career patterns.

S. LESH: I am concerned about job development because in the past, most of it has been given to the employment service as a private kind of reserve. Are you going to follow this procedure?

M. BATTLE: I take issue with you. I don't think job development has been the private purview of the Employment Service.

It is the mandate of the Employment Service in terms of its statutory base and in terms of the way it has been operating, but there has been job development done in a variety of communities by a variety of organizations as the people of that community have seen the need for it. In many instances it has been done in cooperation with and in conjunction with the employment service.

Maybe it means creating a whole new approach to job development in relation to these new careers. Obviously there might be some institutional difficulty in a given community.

S. LESH: Some roles have been institutionalized, and there are people who are unwilling to give them up.

L. LEVINE: With respect to job development, employer contacts, and covering job vacancies, much the same kind of ignorance exists as in the efforts of job engineering and re-engineering. People talk about re-engineering jobs who frequently don't know the content of jobs. Some people talk about employer contacts and employer service and job development as if this is only a matter of knocking out walls and maintaining contacts. The Employment Service doesn't know how to do this job either.

When you begin studying channels of hiring and sources of recruitment in the fields of employment that are expanding, you may discover that the real source of workers in certain occupations and certain industries is the union, not the employer at all. So, if you don't know the unions have a relationship, you don't know about the jobs. In government it may be Civil Service, or it may be some local ward leader.

These things require some kind of specialized professional competence, maybe the Employment Services or different institutions, but the notion that anybody can just jump in and do this sort of thing can do a lot of harm, just as in job engineering you can do a lot of harm.

M. MOED: In the planning of this program have you thought about redressing grievances on the part of the participants in the program? It seems that this is the one group we never evaluate or never hear from. We give them our benevolence and they ought to be thankful for it. When someone comes to Mobilization for Youth, in effect, we have a contract with them to do certain things — an employment service or some other service. How do we know that we are fulfilling this contract, in terms of the people, and if we don't know this, really what voice do they have?

Maybe in a Community Action Agency there is a little more participation. But if it happens to be some guy who is working at the Army Pictorial Center, nobody is going to know about his grievance. One way or another, the people who are in this program should be heard "or else," and then we would know whether the programs are meeting their needs.

R. KANE: I will answer that with two points. Number one, in our guidelines, it says opportunity must be provided for the trainees to become a member with full rights and privileges of any union holding or seeking a bargaining contract with the agency providing the work site.

Second, an advisory committee should be established to insure adequate communication between program participants, CAA and appropriate agency personnel. The purpose will be to determine the adequacy of training and placement and provide a means of assuring an understanding between employers and employees.

APPENDIX A
LEGISLATION

Public Law 89-794
89th Congress, H. R. 15111
November 8, 1966

An Act

80 STAT. 1451

To provide for continued progress in the Nation's war on poverty.

SPECIAL IMPACT PROGRAMS

SEC. 113. Title I of the Economic Opportunity Act of 1964 is amended by—

(1) striking out the heading of such title and inserting in lieu thereof: "TITLE I—WORK TRAINING AND WORK-STUDY PROGRAMS"; and

(2) inserting the following new part immediately following part C:

"PART D—SPECIAL IMPACT PROGRAMS

"ESTABLISHMENT OF PROGRAMS

"SEC. 131. (a) The purpose of this part is to establish special programs which (1) are directed to the solution of the critical problems existing in particular communities and neighborhoods (defined without regard to political or other subdivisions or boundaries) within those urban areas of the Nation having, in the judgment of the Director, especially large concentrations of low-income persons; (2) are of sufficient size and scope to have an appreciable impact in such communities and neighborhoods in arresting tendencies toward dependency, chronic unemployment, and rising community tensions; and (3) where feasible and appropriate, are part of a citywide plan for the reorganization of local or State agencies in order to coordinate effectively all relevant programs of social development.

"(b) In order to carry out the purposes of this part, the Director is authorized to make grants to public or private nonprofit organizations, or to enter into contracts with other private organizations, for the payment of all or part of the cost of programs described in sections 205 (d) and (e) of this Act. The Director shall assure that the work training Post, p. 1458.

80 STAT. 1456

and employment opportunities created under these special programs are filled by the residents of the communities or neighborhoods served, and that the activities pursued are carried out in the communities and neighborhoods described in subsection (a). For the purposes of this section, the Director may include youths aged sixteen to twenty-one who are unemployed, underemployed, or below the poverty level as established for the programs described in sections 205 (d) and (e). Post, p. 1458.

"(c) The Director shall establish such criteria, and impose such conditions, as may be necessary or appropriate to assure that no program assistance under this part will result in the displacement of employed workers or impair existing contracts for services and to assure that the rates of pay and other conditions of employment will be appropriate and reasonable in the light of such factors as the type of work performed, geographical region, and proficiency of the employee.

"(d) In carrying out the provisions of this part, the Director shall establish such procedures or impose such requirements as may be necessary or appropriate to assure maximum coordination with community action programs approved pursuant to part A of title II of this Act.

78 Stat. 516.
42 USC 2781-2791.

"FEDERAL SHARE OF PROGRAM COSTS

"SEC. 132. Federal grants to any program carried out pursuant to this part shall not exceed 90 per centum of the cost of such program, including costs of administration, unless the Director determines, pursuant to regulations adopted and promulgated by him establishing objective criteria for such determinations, that assistance in excess of such percentages is required in furtherance of the purposes of this part. Non-Federal contributions may be in cash or in kind, fairly evaluated, including but not limited to plant, equipment, and services: *Provided*, That where capital investment is required under a contract with a private organization (other than a nonprofit organization), the Federal share thereof shall not exceed 90 per centum of such capital investment and the non-Federal share shall be as defined above."

TITLE I PROGRAMS—DURATION; LIMITATION ON USE OF FUNDS

SEC. 114. Part D of title I of the Act is amended to read as follows:

"PART E—DURATION OF PROGRAM

"SEC. 141. The Director shall carry out the programs for which he is responsible under this title during the fiscal year ending June 30, 1967, and the three succeeding fiscal years. For each such fiscal year only such sums may be appropriated as the Congress may authorize by law."

COMMUNITY ACTION—ADULT WORK TRAINING AND EMPLOYMENT PROGRAMS

79 Stat. 974.

SEC. 206. (a) Section 205 of the Act is amended by redesignating subsection (e) as subsection (f) and by inserting immediately following subsection (d) the following new subsection:

"(e) The Director is authorized to make grants or enter into agreements with any State or local agency or private organization to pay all or part of the costs of adult work training and employment programs for unemployed or low-income persons involving activities designed to improve the physical, social, economic or cultural condition of the community or area served in fields including, but not limited to, health, education, welfare, neighborhood redevelopment, and public safety. Such programs shall (1) assist in developing entry level employment opportunities, (2) provide maximum prospects for advancement and continued employment without Federal assistance, and (3) be combined with necessary educational, training, counseling, and transportation assistance, and such other supportive services as may be needed. Such work experience shall be combined, where needed, with educational and training assistance, including basic literacy and occupational training. Such program shall be conducted in a manner consistent with policies applicable under this Act for the protection of employed workers and the maintenance of basic rates of pay and other suitable conditions of employment."

Union Calendar No. 709

89TH CONGRESS } HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES { REPORT
2d Session } { No. 1568

ECONOMIC OPPORTUNITY AMENDMENTS OF 1966

JUNE 1, 1966.—Committed to the Committee of the Whole House on the State of the Union and ordered to be printed

---

Mr. POWELL, from the Committee on Education and Labor, submitted the following

REPORT

together with

MINORITY VIEWS

[To accompany H.R. 15111]

PUBLIC SERVICE EMPLOYMENT TRAINING PROGRAM

On December 9, 1965, in a major statement on the war on poverty, Chairman Powell declared:

> Should not the primary thrust of the whole antipoverty effort be on jobs? Unemployment is the single biggest scourge in the existence of poverty. To the extent we ignore the creation of a viable national employment program, to the same extent we prostitute the war on poverty.

The chairman subsequently directed that a new emphasis on the creation of jobs and job training be included in the 1966 amendments.

If unemployment is to be significantly curtailed as a substantial cause of poverty, complementary programs providing jobs, training, education, and opportunity for permanent economic advancement are essential to assist the hard-core unemployed, and the countless persons whose unemployment is not exposed to statistical view because they have dropped out of the job market.

The Job Corps and the out-of-school component of the Neighborhood Youth Corps are designed to focus on employment for youth, while work experience under title V concentrates, although not exclusively, on relief recipients.

There remains a substantial pool of hard core, chronically unemployed persons who have not been effectively reached by these Federal programs.

This pool consists primarily of nonwhite adults, whose rate of unemployment is twice that of white adults, and people 45 years of age or older, almost 1 million of whom were actively looking for work in March 1966.

A 1965 amendment to the Economic Opportunity Act sponsored by Senator Nelson of Wisconsin resulted in a proposal to reach the chronically unemployed poor by having them participate in community beautification. Operation Green Thumb, a project which has hired older farmers and farm laborers to beautify highways in Arkansas, Minnesota, New Jersey, and Oregon is an example of the potential of this program.

7

The committee believes that the Nelson amendment, as it now stands, is too limited in the scope of the activities it supports and the size of the program it envisions to reduce substantially the many who are hard-core unemployed. The committee has, therefore, recommended a new amendment specifically designed to enable chronically unemployed individuals to secure entry positions other than as professionals in the public service sector of the economy with built-in opportunities for training and experience. Hopefully these opportunities will lead to promotion and advancement. The outlines of this program were first presented by Congressman James Scheuer.

The demand for human services is urgent. OEO and the Department of Labor estimate the potential employment for aids in the field of health alone, before the advent of medicare, to exceed 1.2 million.

Comparable figures for education, urban improvement, and welfare approximate 3 million. The supply of trained personnel to fill these vital positions is inadequate at present and personnel shortages will become more severe in the future.

Therefore, a public service employment training program will have an anti-inflationary impact on the cost of human services by creating a supply of manpower to keep pace with increasing demand, while reducing chronic unemployment.

The $88 million we have allocated for this program in fiscal 1967 would provide jobs, training, and supportive services for approximately 30,000 to 40,000 people, when coupled with funds available for the employment of aids under medicare and the Elementary and Secondary Education Act.

Given this limited magnitude, the program would, in effect, operate as a demonstration, proving the need for subprofessional or nonprofessional (or similarly designated) personnel and the feasibility of training and utilizing properly supervised chronically unemployed persons to satisfy the need.

If it is to succeed as a meaningful demonstration, the funds must not be scattered piecemeal into every State and county in the United States, but must, instead, be expended in substantial amounts in the few communities where the highest concentrations of chronically unemployed persons are, and where training and employing sizable numbers of such persons in subprofessional capacities can be expected to have the greatest impact upon poverty.

To guarantee that only the chronically unemployed benefit, the committee expects that the program would be limited to those persons from low-income families who have either been unemployed for over 15 consecutive weeks or repeatedly unemployed over the prior 2 years or underemployed (less than 20 hours per week) for over 26 consecutive weeks.

Eligible workers should have no reasonable prospects for full-time employment and be unable to secure either appropriate employment or training assistance under other Federal manpower programs. This job program must be reserved for the hard core, structurally unemployed, who previously have been bypassed by both public and private employers and who might otherwise be denied opportunities to better their position in life.

Since the manpower pool for the positions in this program will, despite these limitations upon eligibility, still be larger than the available openings, some selectivity will inevitably be involved.

In the recruitment process the existence of a record of criminal arrests and/or convictions, which normally results in involuntary unemployment irrespective of ability or desire, should not exclude any individual from employment, unless the record reveals recent conviction of a crime whose circumstances are substantially related to the available positions.

An important measure of the program's progress will be the extent to which professionals are able to tailor the time-consuming tasks they now perform to the skills and potentials of lower paid persons who lack their educational qualifications.

Funds extended under this program to sponsoring public and nonprofit private agencies, organizations or institutions, on a 90-percent matching basis, shall be available for paying the wages of the persons employed at a rate at least equal to the Federal minimum. The committee wishes to emphasize that all projects undertaken under this section are to be locally conceived, organized, and operated to reflect local needs for human services.

This program is not intended simply as a mechanism for supplying compensated work.

Its purpose is to provide jobs as means, not as dead ends. The subprofessional positions should be vehicles enabling participating individuals either to advance within their field of service to more meaningful work at higher levels or to obtain permanent employment in the private sector of the economy. Career potential must be a prime characteristic of any job offered under this program.

To accomplish this basic objective of developing skills and careers, it will be necessary to furnish substantial, carefully planned, and periodically evaluated training to all participants.

On-the-job or in-service training is strongly recommended, but the committee recognizes that many of the newly created aid jobs will require some degree of orientation as well. Efforts to raise the employees' educational level should be undertaken in conjunction with occupational training and should include, where necessary, instruction in literacy and other basic skills.

Health services in the form of preemployment examinations and minor medical treatment should be available to assure participants' physical fitness to perform their assigned tasks as well as counseling and any other supportive service necessary to assure promotion and advancement.

The committee hopes that the Nelson-Scheuer program will make a major dent in the pool of hard-core unemployment by offering them career opportunities and, concomitantly, improve the quality of services received by every member of society.

Calendar No. 1633

89TH CONGRESS } SENATE { REPORT
2d Session } { No. 1666

ECONOMIC OPPORTUNITY AMENDMENTS OF 1966

SEPTEMBER 29, 1966.—Ordered to be printed

Mr. CLARK, from the Committee on Labor and Public Welfare, submitted the following

REPORT

together with

SUPPLEMENTAL, INDIVIDUAL, AND ADDITIONAL VIEWS

[To accompany S. 3164]

NEW PART D—SPECIAL IMPACT PROGRAMS

The purpose of this part is to join the resources, expertise, and energy of American private enterprise with those of the public sector in a special attack on the problems of the Nation's urban areas having the largest concentrations of poverty. It is the feeling of the committee that these resources could be combined and more fully used in the solution of the unique problems of particularly severe poverty concentration, notably: unemployment and dependency on welfare, breakdown of the social service system, and the physical deterioration of slum neighborhoods.

None of these problems can be attacked in isolated fashion; and it is increasingly clear that the resources of government alone are inadequate for the needed total approach. The program created by this part is therefore designed to employ the resources of the private sector—business, nonprofit groups, and the residents of poverty areas themselves—to supplement present government efforts.

The Director would contract with private enterprise, and with public or private nonprofit organizations, to employ and train unemployed and low-income residents of high-concentration of poverty areas in activities designed to improve the conditions of life in the neighborhoods in which they now live. Examples of projects which might be carried out under a coordinated community program are—

> The provision of assistance to a light manufacturing company to establish a shop in the area, integrated with vocational courses in the local high school and with relevant public training programs;
>
> A contract with a department or chain grocery store to establish a branch in the neighborhood as a demonstration store, which would at once employ residents as sales and management personnel, provide quality goods at competitive prices, and train residents to spend their money wisely;
>
> A contract with a nonprofit agency which engages (or would engage) in the rehabilitation of housing for low-income families, under appropriate Federal or State authority, in which local residents would be employed under proper supervision and training to do the work of rehabilitation;
>
> A contract with a private company to train local residents as supplementary tutors for young children, using advanced teaching aids.

It is expected that the Director will establish rules or regulations setting forth supplementary detailed criteria, particularly with respect to area eligibility, with a view to assuring that projects will be of sufficient size to have a major impact on local conditions in communities where the most acute and extensive problems exist.

It is hoped that this new program will encourage improved organization and coordination of local efforts to deal effectively with related problems of social development. Where feasible and appropriate, citywide plans for this purpose would be required. In any event, close coordination between activities under this part and community action programs must be maintained. The bill would direct the Director to establish whatever procedures or requirements may be necessary or appropriate to assure such coordination.

This new part should produce a four-pronged benefit. It will assist in the economic, social and physical rehabilitation of the area, thus making it more livable. It will train and employ its residents in new career-type jobs, and it will improve services to the poor. And, perhaps most important, American private enterprise will be given a chance to participate fully in the war on poverty.

The committee recognizes the need for experimentation and demonstration during the initial development of these special impact programs. Because of the size and complexity of the problem, it is vital for the success of the program that the full resources of both the Department of Labor and OEO be joined at all stages in the implementation of this program. This authorization will provide for the establishment of selected programs, as a result of which the committee will have a sufficient basis to review this program next year to provide for such changes in emphasis as may be indicated.

Two such projects are now in operation. A project in Cincinnati, carried out with Department of Labor experimental and demonstration funds, in cooperation with local labor unions, is training unemployed people as they renovate a six-story building which will be occupied by the Neighborhood Youth Corps and their locally run work-training programs. In the Watts area of Los Angeles, a neighborhood health clinic is being constructed and will be operated by local residents under a research and demonstration grant from the Office of Economic Opportunity.

Projects and programs under this part would be undertaken in those urban areas of the nation having the largest concentrations of unemployed and low-income persons. Eligible areas are to be defined as communities or neighborhoods without regard to political subdivisions or boundaries. It is the intent of the committee to strike at the largest and most severe pockets of urban poverty in the nation, regardless of the size of the urban area itself.

Programs must be of sufficient size and scope to have an appreciable impact in arresting tendencies toward dependency, chronic unemployment, and rising community tensions. Thus, a single project which affected only a small percentage of the unemployed persons in a given neighborhood or community would not be eligible for assistance under this part, except as part of a program whose total impact on the community or neighborhood could be expected to be substantial.

FINANCIAL ASSISTANCE FOR CONDUCT AND ADMINISTRATION OF COMMUNITY ACTION PROGRAMS

SEC. 205. (a) The Director is authorized to make grants to, or to contract with, public or private nonprofit agencies, or combinations thereof, to pay part or all of the costs of community action programs which have been approved by him pursuant to this part, including the cost of carrying out programs which are components of a community action program and which are designed to achieve the purposes of this part. Such component programs shall be focused upon the needs of low-income individuals and families and shall provide expanded and improved services, assistance, and other activities, and facilities necessary in connection therewith. Such programs shall be conducted in those fields which fall within the purposes of this part including, but not limited to,[1] employment, job training and counseling, health, vocational rehabilitation, housing, home management, welfare, and special remedial and other noncurricular educational assistance for the benefit of low-income individuals and families.

(b) No grant or contract authorized under this part may provide for general aid to elementary or secondary education in any school or school system *or for any adult basic education program as described in title II (B)*.

(c) In determining whether to extend assistance under this section the Director shall consider among other relevant factors the incidence of poverty within the community and within the areas or groups to be affected by the specific program or programs, and the extent to which the applicant is in a position to utilize efficiently and expeditiously the assistance for which application is made. In determining the incidence of poverty the Director shall consider information available with respect to such factors as: the concentration of low-income families, particularly those with children; the extent of persistent unemployment and underemployment; the number and proportion of persons receiving cash or other assistance on a needs basis from public agencies or private organizations; the number of migrant or transient low-income families; school dropout rates, military service rejection rates, and other evidences of low educational attainment; the incidence of disease, disability, and infant mortality; housing conditions; adequacy of community facilities and services; and the incidence of crime and juvenile delinquency.

(d) The Director is authorized to make grants under this section for special programs (1) which involve activities directed to the needs of those chronically unemployed poor who have poor employment prospects and are unable, because of age or otherwise, to secure appropriate employment or training assistance under other programs, (2) which, in addition to other services provided, will enable such persons to participate in projects for the betterment or beautification of the community or area served by the program, including without limitation activities which will contribute to the management, conservation, or development of natural resources, recreational areas, Federal, State, and local government parks, highways, and other lands, and (3) which are conducted in accordance with standards adequate to assure that the program is in the public interest and otherwise consistent with policies applicable under this Act for the protection of employed workers and the maintenance of basic rates of pay and other suitable conditions of employment.

(e) The Director is authorized to make grants or enter into agreements with any State or local agency or private organization to pay all or part of the costs of adult work training and employment programs for unemployed or low-income persons involving activities designed to improve the physical, social, economic or cultural condition of the community or area served in fields including, but not limited to, health, education, welfare, neighborhood redevelopment, and public safety. Such programs shall (A) assist in developing entry level employment opportunities, (B) provide maximum

assistance, and (C) be combined with necessary educational, training, counseling, and transportation assistance, and such other supportive services as may be needed.

[e] *(f)* In extending assistance under this section the Director shall give special consideration to programs which give promise of effecting a permanent increase in the capacity of individuals, groups, and communities to deal with their problems without further assistance.

(g) In extending assistance under this section the Director is authorized to make grants for the payment of a reasonable allowance per meeting for attendance at neighborhood community action council or committee meetings and for the reimbursement of other necessary expenses to members of such councils or committees who are residents of the areas and members of the groups served in order to insure and encourage their maximum feasible participation in the development, conduct, and administration of community action programs: Provided, however, That no such payments shall be made to any person who is an employee of the United States Government or of a community action agency.

(h)(1) In making grants for programs in the field of family planning the Director shall assure that family planning services, including the dissemination of family planning information and medical assistance and supplies, are made available to all individuals who meet the criteria for eligibility for assistance under this part which have been established by the community action agency and who desire such information, assistance, or supplies.

(2) No such grant shall be approved unless it contains and is supported by reasonable assurances that in carrying out any program assisted by any such grant, the applicant will establish and follow procedures designed to insure that—

> *(A) no individual will be provided with any information, medical supervision or supplies which such individual states to be inconsistent with his or her moral, philosophical, or religious beliefs; and*
>
> *(B) no individual will be provided with any medical supervision or supplies unless such individual has voluntarily requested such medical supervision or supplies.*

(3) The use of family planning services provided by the applicant under such grant shall not be a prerequisite to the receipt of services from or participation in any other programs under this Act.

89th Congress } HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES { Report
2d Session } { No. 2298

ECONOMIC OPPORTUNITY AMENDMENTS OF 1966

October 17, 1966.—Ordered to be printed

Mr. POWELL, from the committee of conference, submitted the following

CONFERENCE REPORT

[To accompany H.R. 15111]

Special impact programs

The Senate amendment established a new program providing employment for youths and adults. The program is similar to the work-training programs of the Neighborhood Youth Corps (except for N.Y.C. age requirement), and other work-training programs of the bill. The Senate bill specified that this program shall be directed to those urban areas having especially large concentrations of low-income persons; it has also provided great flexibility in program content and financing.

After years of experience with developing and operating work and training programs, the Department of Labor, which has been delegated administrative responsibility for the Neighborhood Youth Corps, has the staff, resources and capacity for the administration of the program. This program shall be implemented in a manner which assures maximum coordination between the Department of Labor and community action programs approved pursuant to part A of title II of this act.

The conferees included in section 132 a limitation of the Federal share of the impact program cost. The limitation provides for a 10-percent matching for public and private nonprofit corporations. Section 132 further provides that where private profitmaking organizations are involved in contracts under this impact program that such organizations must be able to contribute at least 10 percent of the capital investment required to carry out the program. The reason for including this limitation on a contract with a private organization is to insure that such organization has the necessary skills and capital to successfully carry out such a program and that such organization not be one that is sometimes known as a "fly-by-night" organization. The conferees further feel that this program is designed to insure that sound business practices are followed when dealing with private organizations.

Useful work training for unemployed adults

Section 211(1) of the House bill combined in one section (1) useful work training programs for chronically unemployed adults in, but not limited to, areas of conservation, development, or management of natural resources and recreational areas, combined where needed, with educational and training assistance including basic literacy and occupational training, and (2) work training and employment programs for unemployed adults and low income persons in public service and subprofessional occupations involving activities designed to improve the physical, social, economic, or cultural condition of the area of community served.

The House managers feel that the employment training opportunities afforded by this section will be of critical importance in areas where there are extreme shortages of public health supporting personnel and substantial numbers of unemployed persons such as in the Applachian area where local community efforts to sustain the Appalachian regional hospitals have encountered extreme difficulties.

The conference substitute provided for these programs in slightly modified form in two distinct sections.

APPENDIX B

(The following is excerpted from:)

STANDARDS AND PROCEDURES FOR WORK-TRAINING EXPERIENCE PROGRAMS UNDER THE ECONOMIC OPPORTUNITY ACT OF 1964, AS AMENDED

Title II, Section 205(e) – New Careers Program

U.S. DEPARTMENT OF LABOR

TITLE II, SECTION 205 (e) (New Careers Program)

This is a new program authorized by the Congress in 1966. It authorizes grants to or agreements (contracts) with any State or local agency or private organization to pay all or part of the costs of adult work-training employment programs for unemployed or low-income persons involving activities designed to improve the physical, social, economic or cultural condition of the community or area served in fields including, but not limited to, health, education, welfare, neighborhood redevelopment, and public safety.[1] Such programs must (1) assist in developing entry level employment opportunities, (2) provide maximum prospects for advancement and continued employment without Federal assistance, and (3) be combined with necessary educational training, counseling, and transportation assistance, and such other supportive services as may be needed. A major objective of this program is to contribute to and facilitate the process of designing and creating new career jobs in public service (either in the civil services or in private non-profit agencies) as support or sub-professional personnel.

a. *Eligible Projects*

(1) Projects under this program must be designed to prepare unemployed or low-income adults for entry into career jobs in public service as support/sub-professional personnel. Such jobs must offer possibilities for continuing full-time employment and realizable opportunity for promotion and advancement through a structured channel of promotion.

(2) Priority will be given to projects which:

(a) Offer access to unfilled positions in the public service as support/sub-professional personnel. Such positions must provide opportunity for upward mobility and wage salary increases upon the acquisition of greater skill, experience and academic qualifications, e.g., a high school diploma or equivalency certificate or specific vocational training.

---

[1] No positions for sub-professionals already funded under Section 205 of the EOA will be eligible for funding under this Section 205(e), and no reduction in the number of sub-professionals may occur as a result of this new program.

(b) Open new career opportunities leading to permanent jobs or lateral mobility into jobs with more responsibility or higher pay.

(c) Develop occupations which will provide new or improved services to the poor.

(d) Will ease work-loads on professionals in such fields as health, education, welfare, public safety and neighborhood development.

(e) Provide that employing agencies will pay all or part of the enrollees' salaries while engaged in work-training activities. Employing agencies (or other appropriate funding sources) shall be encouraged to pay at least 50 percent of the wages and related fringe benefits, as appropriate, during the second year of a participant's enrollment.

(3) Major emphasis is to be placed on the creation of "New Career" jobs in established institutions which provide a public service. Some such job classifications are already established as support/sub-professional personnel in certain Federally financed programs such as Education Aides, Health Aides and Casework Aides, but they are not being widely utilized by some of the older, more traditional institutions. Other such job classifications have been long established in municipal and State governments but are closed to the poor because of their inability to pass written tests or to meet academic and other standards which are often unrealistic and totally unnecessary to acceptable levels of job performance.

b. *Eligible Persons*

(1) In order to qualify for this program, a person must:

(a) Be 22 years of age or older;

(b) Have an annual family income below the poverty line; or

(c) Be unemployed.

Non-professionals employed by CAA's are eligible for enrollment in this program.[2]

Persons in the employ of employers participating in a project authorized under Section 205(e) are eligible for enrollment in a Section

---

[2] Persons serving as non-professionals in CAA's shall not be forclosed from consideration for enrollment in this program by virtue of such service. Such a person shall be deemed eligible for enrollment PROVIDED THAT: (1) He met the criteria in (1) above at the time of his enrollment by the CAA; and, (2) His employment by the CAA is terminated upon enrollment in this program.

205(e) project provided they meet the eligibility criteria prescribed above.

Detailed eligibility criteria will be found in Part III, hereof.

c. *Program Design*

This program is a job creation effort with major emphasis on access to new careers and will be operated on a demonstration basis. It is to be administered in a manner calculated to derive maximum benefit from both of these special characteristics.

(1) *As a job creation effort*. Projects will be authorized only in those communities where there is a realistic basis for assuming that local, State and Federal agencies and other public service agencies operating in such communities will create and maintain permanent career positions of the types indicated above after Federal support ends; where the project can be expected to have a major effect on the poor and the unemployed and upon the problems which bar such persons from access to dignified and meaningful employment; and, where it can be demonstrated that the disadvantaged poor can successfully prepare for new types of permanent jobs which will provide new or expanded public services in areas of public need. Each applicant should identify more than one "New Career" job title and provide a plan for successive promotions for each.

(2) *Basis of operation*. Projects carried out under this program should serve as models and encouragement to other public and private agencies and organizations, including those in the for-profit sector, to undertake similar experiments and to abandon out-moded concepts and stereotypes. Civil Service Commissions, labor unions – especially unions of government workers – and professional societies must be heavily involved at all levels in order to assist in the task of establishing permanent positions for persons reached and trained under this program and which will be maintained after Federal support is withdrawn.

The importance of the criterion of upward mobility cannot be over-emphasized. Training for "dead-end" jobs will not be authorized. Neither will training be authorized for entry-level jobs on which the wage rate is patently substandard and below the level which would enable the individual occupant to maintain his sense of personal pride and dignity.[3] Finally, great care must be exercised to avoid characterization of "New Career" positions as positions reserved only for the poor. This will require the utmost skill and tact on the part of those charged with the responsibility for implementing individual projects, especially in their relations with the professionals who are to be associated with and assisted by persons served under this program.

---

[3] Wage rates shall be the equivalent of the Federal or State minimum or the prevailing wage in the area, whichever is highest.

Note: As elements of the Community Action Programs authorized under Title II of the Act, the programs authorized under Sections 205(d) and (e) are subject to all the special provisions contained in that Title, in particular, Section 202(c) (3) Participation of the Poor; Section 203, Allotments to States; Section 250(f) Special consideration for projects which promise permanent increase in capacities of individuals, groups and communities; and Section 208(a) Limitations on Federal assistance. In addition, they are subject to relevant Sections of Title VI.

ADULT WORK-TRAINING EXPERIENCE PROGRAMS

Examples of Sub-Professional or "New Career" Positions Which Might be Developed in Connection With Projects Under Section 205(e) of The Economic Opportunity Act, as Amended.

Agency	Task Categories	Possible Job Titles
Schools	Assist truant officer, visit family, develop resources, agency referral.	Attendance Developer
	Under school nurse, visit homes to teach hygiene and health improvement.	Health Educator
	Assist librarian and teachers in working with slow readers. Conduct reading and language laboratories.	Reading Developers
	Tutorial and remedial, home visitation, personal assistance, clerical and machine operations, facility coordination.	Education Assistants
	Supervise recess, physical training activities, free time supervision, physical therapy and other therapies prescribed by professionals, particularly with physically handicapped children.	Physical Developers
	Supervise and conduct examinations and tests. Score tests, keep records.	Test Monitors
Schools Libraries	Process books, file, stack books, keep records, clerical work, supervise craft and club activities.	Library Assistants
	Operate sub-stations, bookmobiles, recruit readers.	Outreach Librarian
Delegate Agencies of CAA's	Information giving and taking — advice, educate, transportation, communication, etc.	Neighborhood Worker
	Direct contact with individuals organizing community groups, liaison with professional staff, community organization.	Community Developer
	Intake, interview, clerical, filing, etc., communications.	Intake Clerk
Employment Service and Programs	Recruit, inform, advise, interpret, provide liaison, assist clients in seeking services, provide intake and data gathering service, clerical and filing.	Employment Worker

Agency	Task Categories	Possible Job Titles
Public or Private Social Agencies	Temporary emergency service, child and older person care, budget, hygiene, health, nutrition, etc., instruction and demonstration, family maintenance.	Homemaker Service Workers
	Casework assistance, transportation, information gathering and dissemination.	Casework Aide
	Inform, demonstrate, instruction and assistance in procurement and utilization of surplus commodities.	Commodity Utilization Developer
	Personal and group programs designed to inform poor of services available and method of obtaining them. Planned parenthood and other service agency assistance.	Information Assistant
Child Care Centers	Non-Headstart care and training of children; supervise group activities, feeding, reading, bathing, etc.	Child Care Instructors
Health	Work with health professionals in hospitals, health clinics and homes to link services and people; provide referrals, treatment and follow-up service and/or health education.	Community Health Service Worker
	Inspection Code enforcement, health education instruction and guidance.	Sanitation Assistant
	Trainee position, bathe patients, take and record temperature, pulse, respiration, apply simple dressings, give uncomplicated treatment, assist in treatment and examination.	Nursing Assistant
	Perform simple laboratory tests, such as urinalysis, blood tests, biological skin tests; take responsibility for the care of the laboratory animals; take responsibility for the maintenance of the laboratory equipment; type blood for transfusion.	Laboratory Assistant
	Prepare patients for X-Ray; affix protective lead plates; assist in keeping of X-Ray room records; develop plates; manipulate switches.	X-Ray Technician Assistant
	Prepare patients for examinations, treatment and dental surgery, and assist dentist; develop X-Ray plates, maintain instruments and equipment.	Dental Aide

Agency	Task Categories	Possible Job Titles
Hental Hospitals, Clinics	Assist with therapy, group conferences, listening, supportive assistance, liaison with professional staff.	Service Workers
Courts — Juvenile and Adult Probation and Parole Officers	Maintain direct contact with family of persons to be sentenced; gather information, establish assistance, probationed parolee contact — counsel, assist and maintain contact; counsel, advise and provide service assistance to families of and prison inmates.	Casework Aide
Legal Services	Receive information, gather evidence, continue contact with clients and/or family; provide communication between attorney and client.	Legal Aide
Police	Operate intake and service program, receive calls, interpret, etc.	Communications Worker
	Monitor parking areas, assist in traffic and safety work, aid in accident data gathering, record keeping and research; education programs with schools, safety patrols.	Enforcement Worker
Recreation and Social Agency	Supervise and coordinate activity programs in playgrounds, clubs, centers, etc.	Recreation Aide
Housing Authority	Operate center activity, relate professional to residents; intake and interview, keep records on Housing Code enforcement.	Service Worker Code Enforcement Worker
Urban Renewal	Communicate, organize, inform, provide service to relocatees, assist in finding housing, moving, settlement.	Relocation Assistant
General Private and Public, Federal, State, Local Government Agencies	Index, file, maintain records, receive and route mail, operate simple machines, data development.	Clerical
	Lookout, inspect public grounds for compliance, put out fires, clean burned areas, fell snags, brush, etc.	Fire Control Aide
	Collect soil samples, assemble information, explain conservation methods; prepare records.	Soil Conservation Aides
	Measure and mark, record tree species and size, thin, plant, prune, enforce rules, keep records, answer questions.	Forestry Aide